DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 075 CG 018 277

AUTHOR Grimley, Liam K., Ed.
TITLE Historical Perspectives on School Psychology.
INSTITUTION Indiana State Univ., Terre Haute. School of Education.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 72p.
AVAILABLE FROM School of Education Publications Office, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN 47809 ($1.50).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Historical Materials (060) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *History; *Professional Associations; Program Development; *School Psychologists; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS Kansas; New Jersey; New York; Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

This monograph was created to stimulate more thorough study of the history of school psychology. In the first section, "Mapping the Territory for Historical Study of School Psychology," by Liam K. Grimley, some fundamental questions are raised about what should be studied in the history of school psychology, how that study might be approached, and how the study of history has relevance to the current practice of school psychology. The second section, "Documentary Evidence," by Thomas K. Fagan and Frances J. Delugach, emphasizes the need for careful scrutiny of documentary evidence and discusses the literary origins of school psychology. The third section contains papers from a symposium on the history of school psychology. The introductory paper by, Jack I. Bardon, focuses on the relevance of state events and individuals to the development of school psychology at the national level. Persons who have made significant contributions to school psychology nationally are cited in this discussion. Personal perspective papers are included on the history of school psychology in Pennsylvania (by Joseph L. French) New Jersey (by Virginia Bennett), and New York (by Gilbert M. Trachtman). The final section, by Edna L. Harrison, reviews the history of state associations of school psychologists and documents the history of the Kansas Association for School Psychologists over the past 10 years. An appendix contains a paper by Thomas K. Fagan describing the background, purpose, activities, structure, and facilities of the Center for the History of School Psychology. (NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258075

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

Edited by

Liam K. Grimley, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Liam K. Grimley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CO-SPONSORED BY

HISTORY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY COMMITTEE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

DIVISION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY
AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CENTER FOR THE HISTORY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY
MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

CURRICULUM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

CG018277

CURRICULUM RESEARCH
AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY • TERRE HAUTE

THE CURRICULUM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER

School of Education, Indiana State University

The Curriculum Research and Development Center of Indiana State University provides school systems the opportunity to secure aid, encouragement, and cooperation in curriculum development projects. It coordinates the participation of University personnel engaged in curriculum work, provides information concerning curriculum development, and initiates and sponsors curriculum research projects. It is the contact point where public schools initiate inquiries regarding curriculum and acts as a vehicle for communication between elementary and secondary schools and the University. Although the CRDC operates as an agency of the School of Education, it represents all departments of the University engaged in curriculum development projects.

Services of the Center are of these major types:

Consultant services—The Center makes available specialists in various curriculum areas to aid in curriculum development. This is on a contract basis and can be adjusted to the needs of the particular task.

Leadership—In the Center, University personnel and others have an agency through which curriculum change can be advocated and other opportunities to exercise leadership can be provided.

Workshop and Conferences—One function of the Curriculum Research and Development Center is the planning and directing of on-campus conferences and workshops as well as those carried on in a school system engaged in curriculum development.

Printed Materials—The Center produces courses of study, bibliographies and similar materials.

Research and Experimentation—The Center provides an environment which encourages research by supplying materials and services needed for experimentation, providing an atmosphere for communication and sharing of ideas, and aiding in acquiring funds for worthy projects.

J. Stephen Hazlett
Dean, School of Education

James E. Higgins
Director

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

Edited by

Liam K. Grimley, Ph.D.

CO-SPONSORED BY

HISTORY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY COMMITTEE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

DIVISION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY
AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CENTER FOR THE HISTORY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY
MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

CURRICULUM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

CG 018 277

CURRICULUM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY ● TERRE HAUTE

The material for this bulletin was prepared and edited by

Liam K. Grimley
Professor of Educational and
School Psychology
Indiana State University

School of Education
Publications:

Dorothea Nelson
Managing Editor

Carole Gustafson
Copy Editor

Sue Lightfoot
Technical Assistant

Published by:

Curriculum Research and
Development Center
School of Education
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

March 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION I: PROLEGOMENON 3

MAPPING THE TERRITORY FOR HISTORICAL STUDY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY
by Liam K. Grimley 4

SECTION II: DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE 13

LITERARY ORIGINS OF THE TERM *SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST*
by Thomas K. Fagan and Frances J. Delugach 14

SECTION III: PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES 23

PERSONS AND STATE EVENTS: THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL
by Jack I. Bardon 24

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY IN NEW YORK STATE: FRAGMENTS OF A HISTORY
by Gilbert M. Trachtman 28

NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY IN PENNSYLVANIA
by Joseph L. French 33

A BRIEF HISTORY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY IN NEW JERSEY
by Virginia Bennett 39

SECTION IV: THE HISTORY OF STATE ASSOCIATIONS OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS . 47

THE FIRST TEN YEARS OF THE KANSAS ASSOCIATION FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS, 1964-1973
by Edna L. Harrison 50

APPENDIX

THE CENTER FOR THE HISTORY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY
by Thomas K. Fagan 65

INTRODUCTION

Liam K. Grimley

The purpose of this monograph is to stimulate more thorough study of the history of school psychology. Such historical study is most timely while access is available to historical figures who were intimately involved in the early development of the profession. These individuals may not have perceived their actions, at a particular point in time, as history in the making (see Bardon in this monograph). They merely perceived themselves as doing whatever needed to be done at a given time and place. It is only in retrospect that those actions assume historical significance.

School psychologists, familiar with child study, are likely to conceptualize history in terms of development, beginning with the profession's infancy, moving through early and middle childhood before entering the turbulence of adolescence characterized by a profession's identity problems (Grimley, 1978; Guidubaldi, 1972). Beyond identity lies adulthood characterized by the mature exploring and examining of relevant foundations, both philosophical and historical. According to French (1984), "It will be some time before the history of the adolescence of school psychology can be written, and much later before adulthood can be described" (p. 985). A profession that aspires to attain the status of mature adulthood must inevitably develop increased awareness of its historical foundations.

The process of historical investigation may be conceptualized in terms of separate and distinct stages. The first stage is that of locating relevant sources, gathering material, identifying key figures--making sure to have as many pieces as possible to the puzzle. The second stage is that of overview, namely, conceptualizing development--identifying the broad shape of the puzzle. The third stage is that of the historian as chronicler, accurately recording events, places, names, dates, and situating them in some appropriate conceptual order. The fourth stage is that of scrutiny, carefully examining each individual element of history, comparing and contrasting these various elements, identifying points of disagreement or contradiction in the evidence.

The final stage is that of the historian as creative artist (Barzun & Graff, 1970). The raw materials of history are events, words, and perspectives. Events which once seemed commonplace may assume importance only in the light of later developments. Eloquent words which were once recorded must be evaluated against the reality of subsequent actions. Individual perspectives of those involved in the making of history must be subjected to scientific investigation. All these varying pieces of the puzzle must be interconnected so that the whole eventually becomes greater than the sum of the parts. At this stage, the historian as creative artist must, out of seeming chaos, evolve creative order.

The methods for studying history are numerous (Cohen, 1947). The methods chosen in this monograph include some consideration of the meaning of historical study, an analysis of documentary evidence, a presentation of personal perspectives of some of those who were perceived as leaders in the field and, lastly, some documentation of what was happening at the grassroots level within an individual state. These various contributions may be seen as fragments of a far richer history that has yet to be developed in the profession s more mature adulthood.

This monograph in no way attempts to present a comprehensive history of the profession of school psychology. But if these pages will stimulate others to engage in similar study, at local, state, and national levels, our purpose will be accomplished.

REFERENCES

Barzun, J., & Graff, H.F. (1970). *The modern researcher.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Cohen, M.R. (1947). *The meaning of human history.* LaSalle, IL: The Open Court.

French, J.L. (1984). On the conception, birth, and early development of school psychology with special reference to Pennsylvania. *American Psychologist, 39,* 976-987.

Grimley, L.K. (1978). Identity crisis in school psychology. *The Journal of School Health, 48,* 538-540.

Guidubaldi, J. (1972). School psychology: A developmental diagnosis. *The School Psychology Digest, 1,* 1-3.

SECTION I - PROLEGOMENON

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

Historical study of school psychology must be perceived as more than a curious interest in past events. In this section, some fundamental questions are raised about what needs to be studied in the history of school psychology, how that study might be approached and, most importantly, how the study of history has relevance to the current practice of school psychology.

A first step in this process of mapping the territory involves formulation of appropriate questions in a manner that is capable of historical investigation. A second step involves understanding aspects of historiography that can help prevent distortion in perceptions of the past. Lastly, from historical analysis new insights are gained into contemporary issues and new questions emerge as prologue for reflection upon the future of school psychology.

MAPPING THE TERRITORY FOR HISTORICAL STUDY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

Liam K. Grimley
Indiana State University

When I was a student in graduate school I developed an interest in the history of school psychology. My study began with somewhat vague and naive questions about the birth of school psychology. Was school psychology the unplanned offspring of a shotgun marriage between the mental health and testing movements? Or was it the stepchild of special education or the little half brother of clinical psychology? Later I wondered if Sarason (1976) was correct in asserting that "school psychology was born in the prison of a test" (p. 587), or was this a distorted Platonic shadow perceived from within the author's own prison cell? A review of the literature would indicate adequate support for any one of these various viewpoints (Bardon & Bennett, 1974; Cutts, 1955; French, 1984; Hutt, 1923; Reynolds, Gutkin, Elliott, & Witt, 1984; Tindall, 1979; Trachtman, 1981; Wallin & Ferguson, 1967; Ysseldyke, 1978). How would the study of history help to resolve this problem?

As a school psychology student it also seemed to me important to identify the "first school psychologist" in the United States. My study revealed that it was a quest that had received considerable attention. For example, Wallin and Ferguson (1967), among others, had identified two possible candidates for this title: Lightner Witmer, for establishing his psychological clinic at the University of Pennsylvania in 1896, and Walter S. Christopher, for his efforts in establishing the first department of child study in an American public school in Chicago in 1899. On the other hand, the students of Henry H. Goddard, who had adapted the Binet Scale in 1908, have been described as "the first school psychology interns" (Cutts, 1955; Herron, Green, Guild, Smith, & Kantor, 1970). Garfield (1965) said that Daniel P. MacMillan, who began work in the Chicago public schools in 1900, "may have been the first school psychologist" (p. 129), whereas Tindall (1979) claimed that "the first school psychologist, Arnold Gesell, was hired by the State of Connecticut in 1915" (p. 10). It should be noted, however, that Gesell's close friend and collaborator, Louise Bates Ames, has maintained that she never heard Gesell refer to himself as "the first school psychologist" (L.B. Ames, personal communication, October 13, 1983).

In sum, I was frustrated that none of these early protagonists seemed concerned with using the title "school psychologist." Nor did I want to perceive the profession I was about to enter as some unplanned child of possible multiple parentage! Through my excessive concern with "genealogical" detail in searching for the frozen embryo, the surrogate mother, or possible sperm donor, I had failed to perceive the rich "genetic pool" from which school psychology had evolved. My study had begun with the wrong set of questions. No amount of historical research would uncover a determinate temporal event by which the profession of school psychology came *ipso facto* into existence. And any attempt to confer the title "first school psychologist" would represent the type of history that Napoleon once described as "fable that is agreed upon." Rather than invent my own set of creative distortions of historical reality to fit the wrong questions I was asking, I would first have to study the nature of historical

research. Only by radically reorganizing my earlier approaches could I chart a more fruitful direction for studying the history of school psychology.

Aspects of Historiography

The making of history is close-at-hand through everyday experience. Its immediacy makes every school psychologist, in one way or another, a recorder of the history of school psychology. Every psychological report--even the recording of a thought or event--becomes a transmittal to the future of what has already become a part of the past. Every author of an article who cites an earlier authoritative work is engaged in the work of historiography. Yet, it is this very immediacy of events that makes the study of history such a complex endeavor. Even eyewitness accounts may not always be similar or accurate. They must be subjected to critical and scientific investigation. The writers of history are not only bounded by the limits of their own perspective of what really happened, but they are subject to their own personal biases. We need therefore to consider some aspects of historiography that can prevent distortions in our understanding of the past.

To understand past events in their proper context, we must first rid ourselves as much as possible of the wisdom of hindsight. Those who have relied upon hindsight to study history have undoubtedly derived much satisfaction from discovering in the past some crude facsimiles of more contemporary ideas such as seeking to determine school psychology's precise "moment of birth" or identifying the "first school psychologist." But these authors inevitably distorted the facsimile to embellish it with a more contemporary perspective. "To these authors," said historian Bailyn (1960), "the past was simply the present writ small. It differed from the present in the magnitudes and arrangements of its elements, not in their character" (pp. 9-10). By failing to see the past as essentially different from the present, we lose true understanding of both origins and growth.

A second task of the historian is to search not only for continuity in history but to seek out and recognize what Braudy (1970) termed "the problem of ruptured continuities" (p. 18). One thinks, for example, of how future historians will grapple with the current continuities and discontinuities of relationships between the American Psychological Association and the National Association of School Psychologists. In studying history, the impulse toward the establishment of continuity not only influences interpretation but may even dictate the initial interests (Braudy, 1970). Without careful attention to the discontinuities of history, personal perceptions of continuity may erroneously be elevated to the realm of historical truth.

Closely related to the problem of discontinuity is the preoccupation with a search for inherent logic in interpreting the past (Bailyn, 1960). The course of events appears to be shaped by two contrasting forces. Some events result from careful planning and follow some logical, sequential order. The founding of APA or NASP are examples of such a logical force at work. But there is an opposite, contrasting force that shapes events in a manner that is not always logical. In this country, for example, we had schools--because they were needed--long before we had trained teachers. We had teachers--because they were needed--long before we had teacher training institutions. We had teacher training institutions--because they were needed--long before we had accreditation agencies. Rather than finding logical ideas translated into policy and policy translated into

practice, we frequently find in history that practice preceded both policy making and conceptualization. The history of school psychology reveals that psychological services were provided in the schools--because they were needed--long before there was any clearly defined concept of the role of school psychologist. When we impose later concepts on the practices that preceded them--through our efforts to discover some perhaps nonexistent innate propulsion in historical development--our understanding of the past is inevitably distorted.

Furthermore, we must approach the study of the history of school psychology with an unbounded capacity for surprise. An example of such surprise is provided by Meacham's (1983) identification of Sidney Bijou--before he went to work with Skinner--as his teacher of projective techniques at the University of Washington. Another potent example is the discovery of Alfred Binet's popular renown as a dramatist of "le theatre de l'horreur" which, according to Wolf (1982) "reminds the modern reader of the zealous following enjoyed by Alfred Hitchcock" (p. 399). The year 1905 was an important one for Binet, not just for the development of an intelligence scale, but because it marked the first production of *L'Obsession*, which, according to his biographer Wolf (1973), was the first play he had co-authored. Some of Binet's correspondence (cited in Wolf, 1982) in 1910 reveals a man who is nervous and distraught, not because of the widely acclaimed second revision of his test, but because he was facing the opening night at the Sarah-Bernhardt theater of his only three-act drama about which he wrote to a friend: "The play will take place at the Sarah B. on October 31 . . . it has filled my time . . . . I am overwhelmed" (p. 401). For myself, as one who began a modest professional acting career on radio at 8 years of age and who later lived some years in France, I am enthralled by what Theodore Simon (1954), his collaborator, told us about Binet: "He loved the theater for itself, for its art, for the structure and workings of its particular domain" (p. 351). This perception of Alfred Binet is somewhat different from the mental image one might have of an eminent turn-of-the-century psychologist running about Paris with a "Binet-Kit" under his arm!

The element of surprise is found not only in present discovery but also in the context of the past. Familiarity with contemporary ideas too often dulls our perception of what may have once been a surprising discovery. The real task of the historian, according to Bailyn (1960), is "to describe the dawning of ideas and the creation of forms--surprising, strange and awkward then, however familiar they may have become since--in response to the changing demands of circumstances" (p. 10).

The history of school psychology involves more than the recording of some important past events. Any search for meaning requires coherent synthesis that emerges, with all the caveats previously noted, from the power of creative imagination which endeavors to identify relationships between otherwise disjointed events. The crux of the problem lies in distinguishing history from fiction. The difference is that, for the historian, imagination must be disciplined by concordance with factual evidence, and synthesis which provides meaning must be as objective as the evidence itself. In this respect the historian must be both scientist and artist. In discussing this twofold role of the historian, Barzun and Graff (1970) remarked:

> First, he contributes the results of his own search for facts as yet unknown, or possibly ill handled by a previous worker. Second, he contributes the organizing principles

and the conclusions or explanations . . . that make of the disconnected facts "a history." In his first capacity the work of the historian may be likened to a science. In the second, it may be considered an art. (p. 16)

The multiplicity of eyewitness accounts of the history of school psychology, such as the series of historical perspectives in the *Journal of School Psychology*, together with the comparative recency of these events, complicate the task of the historian. It is easier to reach agreement about ancient events about which we have only one account--such as Herodotus' description of the battle of Thermopylae--than to document what took place, for example, at the Olympia Conference in 1981. Because of this complexity, it is important to document, as fully and as accurately as possible, the factual events that took place in the early history of school psychology. This evidence is needed, not just for the sake of recording interesting facts, but as the basis for subsequent study of the meaning of ideas.

The Past as Prologue

Historiography is not confined to finding answers to questions about what and where and when things happened in the past. From historical analysis of the past new questions emerge that serve as prologue for reflection on the future.

Eric Fromm, in his foreword to *Summerhill* (1960), provided an example of such historical analysis when he argued that the shift that occurred in the schools from the disciplinary measures of the nineteenth century to the permissiveness of the twentieth was really a shift from "overt" authority to "anonymous" authority. In describing anonymous authority, he wrote:

> Here the sanction of disobedience is not corporal punishment, but the suffering face of the parent, or what is worse, conveying the feeling of not being "adjusted," of not acting as the crowd acts. Overt authority used physical force; anonymous authority employs psychic manipulation. (p. x)

From Fromm's analysis of history some questions arise for reflection: Is emotional abuse through "psychic manipulation" more pervasive though less overt in our schools than the physical abuse of children? Are psychological test scores of children among the most potent weapons used in the exercise of anonymous authority? Have some school psychologists become what Ysseldyke (1978) has termed "psychometric robots" and allowed their destiny to be determined by "the courts, the legislature and special education administrators" (p. 374)? Is it mere coincidence that the shift from "overt" to "anonymous" authority in schools coincided with the historical growth in demand for psychological services in schools?

Another example of historical analysis was provided by Joel H. Spring whose book *Education and the Rise of the Corporate State* (1972) is a lucid history not only of American public schools but also of progressive liberal politics. In his view:

> The corporate image of society turned American schools into a central social institution for the production of men and women who conformed to the needs and expectations of a corporate and technocratic world. (p. 1)

Whatever the well-intentioned rhetoric may be that surrounds the uses of psychological testing, have the results of psychological evaluation been abused all too frequently to further the bureaucratization of education rather than to meet the individual needs of the child? Have our assessment efforts to date been designed, as Ysseldyke (1978) suggested, "to make decisions which have institutional payoff" (p. 377)?

Our understanding of contemporary school psychology will be enhanced, I believe, by considering what historian Cremin (1976) identified as "two discernible revisionist thrusts" (p. 131) in recent historiography of American education. The first, beginning with Bernard Bailyn's *Education in the Forming of American Society* (1960), has sought to situate the educational endeavor within the wider context of society itself. On the one hand, education must be defined more broadly than what occurs in schools and, on the other hand, attention must be directed more specifically to the impact of education on the society that sustains it. The second revisionist thrust, beginning with Michael Katz's *The Irony of Early School Reform* (1968), represents not merely a reassessment but a radical repudiation of progressive-liberal traditions in American education. Both of these thrusts in historiography merit the attention of contemporary school psychologists.

In pursuing Bailyn's [illegible] school psychological services would need to be redefined to encompass the broadest possible context of not only schools, but family, community, and society at large. Trachtman (1966), among others, sought to direct attention to this broader potential domain of school psychological services.

> The educational setting in which the school psychologist works is potentially the most fruitful, the most vital, the most rewarding domain which psychology could enter, with enough room for every sect to erect its own temple, and with each group confident that it is contributing to the general weal. (p. 111)

It is legitimate to ask to what extent the current practice of school psychology reflects such a potentially broad and fruitful domain. Secondly, in line with Bailyn's perspective, school psychologists would need to refocus their attention from studying solely the social forces that have shaped school psychological practice, such as federal and state legislation or judicial decisions, in order to direct equal consideration to the impact which school psychology can have upon society at large. Only by doing so can school psychologists ultimately exercise any control upon their own destiny.

With regard to the second revisionist thrust, Katz's approach to history calls for a more radical appraisal of the American school system. Katz (1971) provided a historical analysis of the class bias that has characterized the bureaucratization of American schools. In this view, the public schools are perceived as having served, since 1850, to make children of the poor and ethnic minorities satisfied with failure in schools which, in turn, leads to low-status occupations. Of the role that psychology has played in this process, Katz wrote:

> Educational psychology, in particular, lost the broad social and philosophic concerns apparent in the writings of early theorists, especially Dewey, and narrowed its

focus, concentrating on testing and measurement of individual differences. (p. 118)

This historical perspective raises important questions about school psychology as an unwitting instrument of class bias within a socio-political bureaucracy. Have abuses of measurement, and of IQ testing in particular, remained the heirs to this historical tradition? The issues of bias in psychological testing are complex and the questions that have been raised do not have easy answers. Reschly (1980) provided a most insightful analysis of the issues related to bias in testing. Reschly (1979) concluded that there are two possible reactions among school psychologists that could be damaging to children. One such reaction would be to conclude that the issue of bias is so complex that we should stubbornly defend and simply continue current practices. A second maladaptive reaction would be to reject the use of current instruments, including conventional IQ tests, in the assessment of culturally different children. "Positive reactions to the concerns about nonbiassed assessment must first be based on a recognition of the ambiguity of the current situation. There are no easy solutions--and there may never be any." (p. 246)

These revisionist historians have undoubtedly contributed to a deeper understanding of bias in the educational enterprise. Schools have not always served as the models of democratic fairness and equal opportunity that popular political rhetoric would suggest. In their counter argument to the revisionists, Levine and Havighurst (1984) appeared to have missed the point when they state:

> One problem in the revisionists' writings is that a reader looks in vain for a consideration of the question: What amount of upward and downward social mobility is viable in a democratic society, where the middle-class families believe they have the right and the obligation to help their children maintain the same or a higher social status? (p. 140)

This concern may be of interest to a middle-class audience. It is scarcely valid criticism of the revisionists to accuse them of failing to ask a question so heavily laden with middle-class bias that it fails to address the needs of society as a whole. The historian Sol Cohen (1976) provided a more cogent critique of the revisionists, whom he termed the "new reconstructionists," by identifying some oversimplification in their methods and conclusions:

> To the new reconstructionists the function of history of education is clearly to serve the cause of social reconstruction. . . . Novel canons of historical writing are introduced. . . . There is a finality and rationality about their work that terribly oversimplified the ambiguity, the incompleteness, the complexity of historical events. (pp. 327-328)

An even more critical analysis of the revisionists' arguments is provided by Ravitch (1977). While identifying the limitations of their arguments, she nevertheless perceived the inherent value of their ruthless scrutiny:

> Their works raise important social, political, and economic issues. Their aspirations for equality, freedom, and

justice are in keeping with a long and principled tradition of radical protest in American history. (p. 9)

One of the great benefits that derive from the study of history is the obligation it imposes for future thoughtful reflection. When elements of the past are singled out for radical questioning or needed change--as inevitably should happen in historical research--an unbalanced perception of repudiating the past may be conveyed. The history of school psychology does not always support a theory of perpetual and unwavering progress. Neither does it support a counter-theory of failure and despair. In discussing the polarity and oscillation between progress and degeneration in historical perspectives, Cohen (1947) remarked:

> The dominant forces in human nature which seem to me to be relevant for an understanding of history are the expansive forces, which involve adventure, and the centralizing or organizing forces, which protect us against those elements that would destroy us. (p. 273)

is with consciousness of these contrasting forces that we need to approach the study of the history of school psychology.

Summary

The study of history is presented as being more than a peculiarly fanatical interest in the recording of past events. Before engaging in the study of the history of school psychology some conceptual understanding is needed about the nature of this task. The territory to be investigated must first be mapped, through formulation of questions, in a manner that is capable of historical investigation. The historian must, as far as possible, set aside the bias that may come from the perspectives of hindsight or from a one-sided search for continuity and inner logic in historical development. In other words, the past must be perceived as different from the present. This approach necessitates an unlimited capacity for surprise, especially when faced with ideas which were once new but have since become commonplace. The synthesis and imagination of the historian must be disciplined by concordance with factual evidence. The recordings of firsthand witnesses to the early growth of school psychology are of particular significance because they provide the basic scientific sources of historical research.

Beyond the recording of past events lies the search for contemporary meaning. Recent developments in historiography of American education have particular relevance to the profession of school psychology. From such historical research new insights are gained into contemporary issues and new questions emerge for thoughtful reflection upon the future. It is these aspects in particular that give meaning and importance to the historical study of school psychology.

REFERENCES

Bailyn, B. (1960). *Education in the forming of American society.* New York: Norton.

Bardon, J.I., & Bennett, V.C. (1974). *School psychology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barzun, J., & Graff, H.F. (1970). *The modern researcher.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Braudy, Leo. (1970). *Narrative form in history and fiction.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cohen, M.R. (1947). *The meaning of human history.* LaSalle, IL: The Open Court.

Cohen, S. (1976). The history of the history of American education, 1900-1976: The uses of the past. *Harvard Educational Review, 46,* 298-330.

Cremin, L.A. (1976). *Traditions of American education.* New York: Basic Books.

Cutts, N. (Ed.). (1955). *School psychologists at mid-century.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

French, J.L. (1984). On the conception, birth, and early development of school psychology. *American Psychologist, 39,* 976-987.

Fromm, E. (1960). Foreword by Erich Fromm. In A.S. Neill, *Summerhill,* New York: Hart.

Garfield, S.L. (1965). Historical introduction. In B.B. Wolman (Ed.), *Handbook of clinical psychology.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Herron, W.G., Green, M., Guild, M., Smith, A., & Kantor, R.E. (1970). *Contemporary school psychology.* Scranton, PA: Intext Educational Publishers.

Hutt, R.B.W. (1923). The school psychologist. *Psychological Clinic, 15,* 48-51.

Katz, M.B. (1968). *The irony of early school reform: Educational innovation in mid-nineteenth century Massachusetts.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Katz, M.B. (1971). *Class, bureaucracy and schools: The illusion of educational change in America.* New York: Praeger.

Levine, D.U., & Havighurst, R.J. (1984). *Society and education.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Meacham, M.L. (1983). The development of school psychology in the state of Washington: A personal perspective. *Journal of School Psychology, 21,* 1-7.

Ravitch, D. (1977). The revisionists revised: Studies in the historiography of American education. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Education, 4,* 1-84.

Reschly, D.J. (1979). Nonbiased assessment. In G.D. Phye and D.J. Reschly (Eds.), *School psychology: Perspectives and issues.* New York: Academic.

Reschly, D.J. (1980). *Nonbiased assessment.* Des Moines, IA: Department of Public Instruction.

Reynolds, C.R., Gutkin, T.B., Elliott, S.N., & Witt, J.C. (1984). *School psychology: Essentials of theory and practice.* New York: Wiley.

Sarason, S.B. (1976). The unfortunate fate of Alfred Binet and school psychology. *Teachers College Record, 77,* 579-592.

Simon, T. (1954). Souvenirs sur Alfred Binet. *Bulletin, La Societe Alfred Binet, 415,* 341-360.

Spring, J.H. (1972). *Education and the rise of the corporate state.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Tindall, R. (1979). School psychology: The development of a profession. In G.D. Phye & D.J. Reschly (Eds.), *School psychology: Perspectives and issues.* New York: Academic.

Trachtman, G.M. (1966). My brother is a hairy man. *Psychology in the Schools, 3,* 110-115.

Trachtman, G.M. (1981). On such a full sea. *School Psychology Review, 10,* 138-181.

Wallin, J.E.W., & Ferguson, D.G. (1967). The development of school psychological services. In J.F. Magary, *School psychological services in theory and practice: A handbook.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Wolf, T.H. (1973). *Alfred Binet.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wolf, T.H. (1982). A new perspective on Alfred Binet: Dramatist of *le theatre de l'horreur. The Psychological Record, 32,* 397-407.

Ysseldyke, J.E. (1978). Who's calling the plays in school psychology? *Psychology in the Schools, 15,* 373-378.

SECTION II - DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

One of the most important methods for the study of history is the careful scrutiny of documentary evidence. This method of historical investigation is often exacting, time consuming, frustrating, and tedious. Furthermore, by focusing on cold, objective detail, it is possible to lose sight of the more human dimensions of history. Yet, the Latin adage "Littera scripta manet" provides a healthy reminder of the importance of documentary evidence.

In this second section, Thomas K. Fagan and Frances J. Delugach provide an example of the value of this aspect of historical investigation. Not willing to give easy credence to statements by others which appeared to lack adequate documentation, these authors have pursued, with considerable energy, a literary search that has brought new knowledge on the origins of the very title of the profession--the term *school psychologist*.

LITERARY ORGINS OF THE TERM *SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST**

Thomas K. Fagan and Frances J. Delugach
Memphis State University

The earliest comprehensive treatment of school psychology in a professional journal appears to be the July-August 1942 issue of the *Journal of Consulting Psychology (JCP)*. While articles related to school psychology had appeared for many years in other journals and in earlier editions of that journal (e.g., employment trends in school psychology and other applied fields had been published three years earlier by Finch & Odoroff, 1939), this particular issue of the *JCP* was significant in that it was devoted almost entirely to school psychology. It was the task of Percival M. Symonds in his lead article to consider the historical antecedents and current status of the field. In describing the origin of published literature in school psychology, he stated, "The use of the term school psychologist first appeared in the published literature in 1923, so far as I am able to discover" (p. 173). Symonds' reference was to an article by R.B.W. Hutt, M.A. entitled "The School Psychologist" that appeared in a 1923 issue of *The Psychological Clinic*. It was perhaps an appropriate citation of the supposed literary origin of the term *school psychologist* since *The Psychological Clinic* had been founded in 1907 by Lightner Witmer, a remarkable clinician whose contributions to the individual study of children have encouraged applied psychologists of many persuasions to claim his method (clinical psychology) and his clinic at the University of Pennsylvania as origins for their present practice.

We became interested in the question of the true literary origin of *school psychologist* largely parallel to a concern regarding the historical consensus that Arnold Gesell was the first person in this country to hold the title "school psychologist." It intrigued us that he would have been granted that title (or chosen it) in the absence of literary or statutory recognition of the title.

For several reasons we considered it unlikely that we would find an earlier literary origin. First, the article by Hutt employed the term *school psychologist* only in the title. The term appears nowhere else in the body of the text which suggests that he had coined it for the literature and that previous literature had preferred the term *psychologist in the school setting*, terminology which even he preferred throughout his article. Second, the article had another characteristic, which on first inspection appeared to be a historian's dream: no references to any previous literature. But as avid perusers of the literature of that period, we recognized that the absence of references was common in many journals of that time and could not be relied upon to suggest the absence of relevant earlier literature.

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Dr. Robert Vidulich, professor of psychology at Memphis State University in the area of history and systems, for his assistance in reviewing the manuscript. Correspondence and requests for reprints should be addressed to Thomas K. Gafan, Department of Psychology, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee 38152.

*From *School Psychology Review*, 1984, *13*, pp. 216-220. Reprinted by permission.

Because the Hutt article had appeared in *The Psychological Clinic* and because we had determined that Hutt had worked in Witmer's clinic as an examiner prior to the appearance of his article (Fernberger, 1931), we hypothesized that the most likely earlier source of the term *school psychologist* would be the editions of *The Psychological Clinic* between 1907 (founding date) and 1923. We found that the term was present in only one earlier issue of that period, appearing in a "News and Comment" editorial (Witmer, 1913) about Cyril Burt's historic London appointment. It was clear that the term had appeared prior to 1923 but only in an editorial context.

We were also searching in another direction with the assistance of Louise Bates Ames, a former colleague and student of Gesell and still affiliated with The Gesell Institute for Human Development. With her cooperation, we managed to gather considerable information about Gesell including biographical data. He was a man of broad medical and psychological training, holding both the PhD from Clark University and the MD from Yale. His interests, professional stature, and research techniques were reflected in the extensiveness with which he published between 1905 and 1959: numerous books and scores of articles in more than two dozen different journals. If indeed he was the first *school* psychologist (he does acknowledge this recognition in his autobiography), was it possible that he may have discussed either his experiences or his historic appointment in his own writings prior to the appearance of the Hutt article? Thanks to the cooperation of Dr. Ames and a biographical memoir of Gesell prepared by Miles (1964), a complete listing of all his early publications was readily available. Of the 21 publications during the period 1915 (when Gesell was appointed as "school psychologist" with the State of Connecticut) through 1922, several seemed to hold the possibility by title of supporting our hunch. Since we had reason to believe that his term of appointment was limited to 1915-1919, emphasis was placed on searching articles of that period. He published no articles in 1915, 1916, or 1917, two in 1918 (Gesell, 1918a and 1918b) and three in 1919 (Gesell, 1919a, 1919b; Gesell, Goddard, & Wallin, 1919). Of the five publications, three (Gesell, 1918a, 1918b, 1919a) employed the term *school psychologist* but only on the cover as a designation of the author's official title with the State of Connecticut. The other two, while providing interesting commentary on early conflicts in professional psychology and the American Association of Clinical Psychologists, as well as the early efforts at mental hygiene, did not use the term *school psychologist* at all. Some time later, we received an additional Gesell article (1921) which included a rationale for why state departments of education should take the lead in providing services for the handicapped (a theme throughout much of his literature during this period and closely associated with his functions as Connecticut's school psychologist). Blended into that rationale he indicated the singular effort of the Connecticut Board of Education which "in 1915 appointed a school psychologist. . ." (p. 80). At that point it appeared that Arnold Gesell was the first person and the first school psychologist to have, perhaps unknowingly, used the term in the literature in this country in a non-editorial article.

Perhaps common to historical discovery, doubt rather than relief set upon us. While searching the Gesellian connections, we had acquired a copy of what may be the earliest book on school psychology (Hildreth, 1930). On page 31, the author states, "The German psychologist Stern was one of the earliest writers to employ the term 'school psychologist.'" Unfortunately, Hildreth made no specific mention of the source of Stern's usage, nor did she mention in the text or its extensive bibliography

the Gesell or Witmer citations already uncovered! Could the Stern usage of the term have been earlier than those of Gesell (1921) and Witmer (1913)? Employing the Hildreth bibliography and other resources, we began searching for early publications by Stern. Among many other things we learned that Stern was a native German, educated in that country and a significant scholar of diverse interests, particularly in differential psychology and the mental testing of children. His early works on these subjects reveal him to have put forth the concept and procedure of determining the intelligence quotient and even early efforts at profile analysis. His contributions were not always quickly available to persons in the United States because they were published in the German language literature and had to be translated into English for publication in this country. We uncovered an additional editorial item in the *Journal of Educational Psychology* (1913) in which G.M. Whipple used the term *school psychologist* in announcing the historic appointment of Cyril Burt in London. Whipple's editorial appeared 6 months before that of Witmer (1913) and may have been the source of some of Witmer's information. Burt, however, had been appointed as an "educational psychologist" (Burt, 1952), a term that has been often preferred in Great Britain; thus, it seemed likely that Whipple must have acquired the term elsewhere and applied it to his own editorial. Further research indicated that Whipple and Stern were familiar with each other's work and that Whipple was the translator for one of Stern's books, *Psychological Methods of Testing Intelligence*, originally written in German (1912) and published in English in 1914. On page 12 of that translation, Stern employes the term *school psychologists* in his discussion of the need for qualified personnel to administer psychological tests. This usage predates any of Gesell's citations by several years, not to mention Hutt's (1923). We also uncovered another translation by Lucy M. Day (Stern, 1911a) in the *Journal of Educational Psychology (JEP)* entitled "The Supernormal Child" which also provided a source of the term in published literature. In his discussion of the need for providing appropriate services to supernormal (gifted) as well as other exceptional children in Germany, Stern provided the following prediction:

> The seemingly Utopian character of these views need not alarm us; least of all at the present time. Only five years ago the idea that there ought to be special judges for children seemed quite as Utopian, yet today they are an accomplished fact. Quite as quickly was the introduction of school physicians brought about, though at first strenuously opposed by educators as an intrusion.
>
> Quite the same thing will occur in the case of school psychologists; they will come because they are necessary. The need of a permanent examining and supervising bureau of school psychology (of whose tasks the control of supernormal children is but one) will make itself evident, and will lead to the appointment of specialists and the establishment of municipal bureaus for the conduct of tests. (p. 189)

In our opinion, this is the most likely source for the original use of the term *school psychologist* in the published English literature. Stern's autobiography and other writings which we reviewed used no such term nor even made reference to *school psychology*; neither had our reviews of earlier issues of several other journals.

One additional question remained: Was Stern's usage literal or had Lucy M. Day become the first to use the term through an accidental non-literal translation? This seemingly easy question to answer required substantial searching. The 1911 translation by Day was in two parts appearing in separate, though consecutive, issues of the *JEP*. The German source of the translation appeared only in Part I, and that citation proved insufficient for our Interlibrary Loan Department to obtain the document. We had, incidental to our own literature search, requested a copy (in German) of Stern's text *Die Differentielle Psychologie* (1911b). Buried in its ninety-five page bibliography appeared references for both the Day translation and the original Stern article (p. 446). After several weeks the new reference produced a copy of the article in German via Interlibrary Loan from Ohio State University. A translation by Dr. Leo A. Connolly of the Memphis State University Foreign Languages Department provided the answer. Hildreth's lead had been right, Day's translation *was* literal, and Stern (1910) became the earliest literary source of the term *school psychologist*.[1]

What prompted Lucy M. Day to translate Stern's article into English for publication will probably be forever unknown. It is reasonable to hypothesize that since Whipple was among the editors of the *JEP* at that time, was familiar with Stern's contributions, and was a colleague of Day at Cornell University, he may have acquired the article in German and asked Day to translate it for publication in that issue of the *JEP*. Whipple published a "News and Notes" item on the supernormal child in the same issue and probably preferred not to translate Stern's work on the same topic himself. Why Stern used the term in his German writings and precisely how he acquired it (or "thought it up") may well have been laid to rest with him in 1938.

What emerges from a lengthy search for the earliest literary origins of the term *school psychologist* are the following historical generalizations:

1. Hutt (1923): first usage of the term in the title of a publication.

2. Gesell (1918a): first usage of the term in the title of the author's position; and first school psychologist by title to employ the term in the literature (Gesell, 1921).

3. Stern (1914): first usage of the term in a text printed in English via Whipple's translation.

4. Whipple (1913): first usage of the term in an editorial publication. This predated Witmer (1913) by 6 months.

5. Stern (1912): first usage of the term in a text printed in Germany.

6. Stern (1911a): first appearance of the term in English literature via Day's translation.

7. Stern (1910): first appearance of the term; printed in Germany.

It is important that future texts on, or including, school psychology history note the inaccuracy of the Symonds (1942) judgment. This judgment is reflected in at least five of the texts in school psychology which

discuss the origins of this field.[2] Three of these texts (Cutts, 1955; Gray, 1963; White & Harris, 1961) refer to the Symonds article, while two (Herron, Green, Guild, Smith, & Kantor, 1970; Bardon, 1982) refer directly to the Hutt article without reference to Symonds. Our research demonstrates several earlier citations that provide a more definitive basis from which to judge the early history of school psychology.

It is historically significant that Stern, writing in Germany in 1910, was describing a need for services that had already taken root in many cities in this country, perhaps the earliest being Chicago in 1899. Stern's writings make it clear that he was aware of many developments in this country, and he was the one to label a method (clinical psychology) described by Witmer as early as 1896 and commonly applied to the problems of school-aged exceptional children.[3] Perhaps by historical chance the efforts of Witmer, Whipple, Day, and Stern merged to provide the first applied psychology label that was setting-specific (to the school). None of these persons referred to themselves as "school psychologists." That title seems to remain with Gesell alone in our earliest literature. Thus it was from the writings of a German psychologist that a professional label seems to have emerged in 1910 that gradually gained popularity in the literature over the next thirty years, blossoming after World War II into the profession of school psychology as we now know it.

In retrospect, one might wonder how it was that Symonds was unaware of the sources earlier than Hutt (1923). In justification of his oversight, it should be noted that the Hutt reference remains the earliest one specifically referring to the "school psychologist" in its title. Hence, it stood out in any bibliographic search of that period. Symond's contributions to the practice of psychology were substantial (e.g., *The Picture Story Test*, *The Symonds Adjustment Questionnaire*, and articles and books on personality assessment), and it is unlikely he would have cited the Hutt item casually. Nor did Symond's article with the Hutt citation appear without some subsequent editorial commentary. In the following issue of the *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, J.E.W. Wallin (1942), an eminent figure in the history of clinical psychology, school psychology, and special education, clarified several of Symond's historical assumptions including the Hutt citation; but he provided no literary refutations, only commentary on the usage of practitioner titles like "school psychologist" prior to 1923. He could have resolved the issue at that time had he simply remembered to cite the Day translation of Stern's article on the supernormal child as he had twenty-eight years earlier in his text *The Mental Health of the School Child* (Wallin, 1914, p. 238). Nor is any mention made of Stern or Day in Wallin and Ferguson (1967). It appears that Wallin's (1942) admonitory advice to Symonds applies to everyone who studies the history of school (or any other) psychology:

> We should have histories of new developments that are authentic and accurate, but this is impossible without an exhaustive perusal of the relevant literature.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The German text for the second paragraph of the above citation of the Day translation of Stern (1910, p. 166) is as follows: "Ganz ahnlich wird es mit den Schulpsychologen gehen; sie werden kommen, weil sie notwendig sind. Ein standiger schulpsychologischer Prufungs- und Uberwachungsdienst (unter dessen Aufgaben die Kontrolle der Ubernormalen nur eine

unter vielen ist), wird sich bald als Bedurfnis erweisen und zur Anstellung besonderer Pensonlichkeiten, sowie zur Errichtung stadtischer Prufungsstationen fuhren."

[2]The introduction to Section 1 of *Psychological Services in the Schools: Readings in Preparation, Organization and Practice* by Holt and Kicklighter (1971) simply refers to the appearance of the term in the professional literature as occurring "in the late 20's."

[3]Stern had traveled to the United States in 1909 to receive an honorary doctorate from Clark University at the invitation of G. Stanley Hall, then University President. He was among several eminent psychologists, physicians, and educators so honored at the 1909 Clark Conference. Among those appearing in the group photograph of the event are Freud, Goddard, Hall, Stern, and Whipple. Correspondence between Stern and Hall following the event indicated that the two shared interests in areas of child psychology work in both the United States and Germany. (These letters were obtained from the Clark University Archives.)

REFERENCES

Bardon, J.I. (1982). The psychology of school psychology. In C.R. Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (pp. 3-14). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Burt, C. (1952). Autobiography. In E.G. Boring, H. Werner, H.S. Langfeld, & R.M. Yerkes (Eds.), *A history of psychology in autobiography, Vol. IV* (pp. 53-73). Worchester, MA: Clark University Press.

Cutts, N.E. (1955). *School psychologists at mid-century.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Fernberger, S.W. (1931). The history of the psychological clinic. In R.A. Brotemarkle (Ed.), *Clinical psychology: Studies in honor of Lightner Witmer to commemorate the thirty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the first psychological clinic* (pp. 10-36). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Finch, F.H., & Odoroff, M.E. (1939). Employment trends in applied psychology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 3,* 118-122.

Gesell, A. (1918a). *What can the teacher do for the deficient child? A manual for teachers in rural and graded schools.* Hartford, CT: State Board of Education (Connecticut School Document No. 5-1918, Whole Number 425).

Gesell, A. (1918b). *Febbleminded children in the county home schools of Connecticut.* Hartford, CT: State Board of Education (Bulletin 72).

Gesell, A. (1919a). *A follow-up study of one hundred mentally deficient school children.* Hartford, CT: State Board of Education (Bulletin 26).

Gesell, A.L. (1919b). Mental hygiene and the public school. *Mental Hygiene, 3,* 4-10.

Gesell, A.L. (1921). Public school provision for exceptional children. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 98,* 73-81.

Gesell, A.L., Goddard, H.H., & Wallin, J.E.W. (1919). The field of clinical psychology as an applied science. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 3,* 81-95.

Gray, S.B. (1963). *The psychologist in the schools.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Herron, W.G., Green, M., Guild, M., Smith, A., & Kantor, R.E. (1970). *Contemporary school psychology.* Scranton, PA: Intext Educational Publishers.

Hildreth, G.H. (1930). *Psychological service for school problems.* Yonkers-on-Hudson, NY: World Book Co.

Holt, F.D., & Kicklighter, R.H. (1971). *Psychological services in the schools: Readings in preparation, organization and practice.* Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Co.

Hutt, R.B.W. (1923). The school psychologist. *The Psychological Clinic, 15,* 48-51.

Miles, W.R. (1964). Arnold Lucius Gesell, 1880-1961. In *National Academy of Sciences, Biographical Memoirs Vol. 37.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Stern, W. (1910). D. ubernormale kind. *Der Saemann Monatschrift Fuer Paedagogische Reform.* Jahrg, S. 97-72 u.s. 160-167.

Stern, W. (1911a). The supernormal child II. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 2,* 181-190. Part I appeared on pp. 143-148 of the same volume; translations by L.M. Day.

Stern, W. (1911b). *Die Differentielle Psychologie, in ihren methodischen Grundlagen.* Leipzig: Verlag von Johann Ambrosium Barth.

Stern, W. (1912). *Die psychologischen Methoden der Intelligenz-prufung.* Leipzig: Barth.

Stern, W. (1914). *The psychological methods of testing intelligence* (G.M. Whipple, Trans.). Baltimore, MD: Warwick & York, Inc.

Symonds, P.M. (1942). The school psychologist-1942. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 6,* 173-176.

Wallin, J.E.W. (1914). *The mental health of the school child.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wallin, J.E.W. (1942). The "school psychologist" in retrospect. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 6,* 309-312.

Wallin, J.E.W., & Ferguson, D.G. (1967). The development of school psychological services. In J.F. Magary (Ed.), *School psychological services in theory and practice: A handbook* (pp. 1-29). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Whipple, G.M. (1913). Editorial: The school psychologist in London. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 4,* 176.

White, M.A., & Harris, M.W. (1961). *The school psychologist.* New York: Harper & Bros.

Witmer, L. (1913). News and Comment: London has a clinical psychologist for the schools. *The Psychological Clinic, 7,* 171.

SECTION III - PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

All the papers in this section were invited presentations at a symposium on the history of school psychology held April 19, 1984, at the annual convention of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) in Philadelphia. The symposium, which was co-chaired by Allen Cohen and Liam K. Grimley, opened with a brief presentation by Thomas K. Fagan on the purpose of The Center for the History of School Psychology (see Appendix).

In reading these papers, four aspects of the symposium should be kept in mind. First, since the NASP convention in 1984 was being held in the Northeastern Region, it was decided to focus attention primarily on states in that region. Because the NASP convention is held in a different region each year, it is anticipated that additional knowledge will be accumulated over a period of years regarding the history of school psychology in the various states of the nation.

Second, it was understood that the invited speakers would present their own *personal perspectives* rather than attempt a more comprehensive, and perhaps more objective, chronicle of events, places, and dates. These personal perspectives help provide insight into the more human aspects of the history of school psychology rather than the more dry factual details recorded by the professional chroniclers of historical events.

Third, the time limits imposed by a symposium format necessitated selectivity in the issues and topics addressed in these papers.

Last, it should be borne in mind that these papers were prepared for oral presentation. Even though written expression is sometimes more formal, it was decided to retain, as much as possible, the oral form in which these papers were initially presented.

Participants in the symposium, "Personal Perspectives on the History of School Psychology," at the NASP convention in April 1984: Allen Cohen, Jack Bardon, Virginia Bennett, Gil Trachtman, Tom Fagan, Liam Grimley, and Joe French.

PERSONS AND STATE EVENTS: THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

Jack I. Bardon
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

History, to my mind, is really whatever is happening now, interpreted later by people who weren't there who then add other pieces of information about other related events in order to offer a perspective not as easily available to those who were there. So, my personal perspective is undoubtedly biased and reflects where I was at any given time. When you do things to make a living and to further your field, you don't think of it as history in the making. At least I don't. It's just what you do. It is a bit of a shock to think that time goes by so quickly, that such mundane activities are perceived as chronologically ordered events, with causes explained, that show where you and others have come and why. In psychology, our history as a field is so short that relatively recent events are seen historically more quickly than in some other fields.

What can I add that others might not do as well? I've decided that what I can talk about are those personal encounters that may not be recorded elsewhere, as I saw them when they happened, and to say something about what they have contributed to our current state of affairs.

Let me begin with some of the people here with us in this symposium.

The first time I saw Gil Trachtman he was a presenter at an American Psychological Association (APA) symposium in New York City. It must have been in the early 1960s. It could have been even earlier. Sitting in the audience, I heard school psychologists from New York State talk about him--with obvious reverence, adoration, admiration. Frankly, I had never heard anyone talk about a school psychologist that way--it was the way people at that time talked about Carl Rogers or Rollo May. It was, "Well, Gil said," or "Did you hear what he answered when she said that?" I don't recall exactly what he talked about, but it was futuristic, irreverent, and called for change. He came to the platform in an open shirt and a pair of rumpled slacks when everyone else was dressed in suit uniforms. He was not the imposing figure I had expected, but when he spoke people listened--including me. As often happens, the medium is more powerful than the message, and it was that way when I first saw Gil.

What does this have to do with history? That presence, coupled with a clear call for reform, for change and, I learned later, for the rights of those who were not getting an even break--such as nondoctural school psychologists, parents, and children--has continued to influence the field. When Gil spoke, people reacted. During the pre-national days (I date that as before about 1965), his influence was felt primarily in New York State, but broadened as Gil moved into the education and training of school psychologists at New York University. But there is one special event associated with him that I think has had considerable national impact on our field. Again, I do not recall the date--maybe Gil does--but it is my recollection that it was in the mid-1960s. A fairly routine business meeting of the Division of School Psychology (Division 16) of APA was being held. Whether by design or not I don't know, but a resolution was presented to give all associate (nondoctoral) members of the

Division full membership rights within the Division, even though they could not be full members in the Association itself. The spokesperson--we called them spokesmen in those days--was Gil, and he was extraordinarily persuasive during fairly active debate. That positive vote offered the first professional encouragement to nondoctoral school psychologists at the national level that they could be part of a national professional establishment, and I think is a milestone in the direction later taken by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

Joe French and I met for the first time in 1966 when he invited me to speak at Penn State University. I knew of him before then, but primarily as the writer of a textbook on the gifted which I had used as part of a course at Rutgers University. The program was well organized, well attended, and purposeful, all characteristics of Joe French's impact on the field. Like Gil, he has been an important influence in his own state; unlike Gil, he has been less flamboyantly visible. His contributions both at the state level and at the national level--which I know better--seem to me to have been cautious, data-based, with special concern for standard setting and for bringing people together to solve problems across disciplines and fields. He has been among school psychology's best chroniclers, showing where we are and what training is like and pointing the way carefully to a better future.

One particular event I shared with him, but he didn't even recall it. When NASP was in formation--before it actually came into being--many of us were concerned about the meaning of its development, concerned about its serving to divide school psychology into a psychology and an educational component. Before NASP formed, Joe wrote to 1,400 psychologists who were members of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) proposing that CEC form a Division for School Psychologists. I assume he was trying to find a way to keep school psychology from moving too far from APA and at the same time recognizing the need for some alternative way to organize and receive acknowledgment and professional support. He did not get a good response and immediately, upon learning that NASP had formed, wrote again to CEC psychologists, in March of 1969, urging them to support NASP *and* Division 16 of APA. His influence has been and continues to be that of moderation during immoderate times and, in my mind, he has been a counterforce, keeping balance between Gil's strong stands, for instance, and the conservative and sometimes ill-informed body politic of APA. That kind of historical contribution is difficult to document and substantiate. I wanted it on the record somewhere that Joe French has played an unusual and important role in keeping school psychology on a reasonably sane path.

Virginia Bennett is another story, perhaps one I am least qualified to speak to because our professional lives have been so intertwined. It was sometimes impossible for almost 20 years to speak separately about our views or our professional activities. But I'll try anyway. Virginia, as she will, burst on the scene in 1960 at Rutgers University as what has been called a "mature" student. Having already been a registered nurse and a kindergarten teacher, within a brief three years of graduate study and internship she was ready to make waves. She has done so much--in New Jersey, but even more within APA--that all I can really do is to isolate some events that may be less well known than others.

When it was time in the mid-1960s to test the proposition that school psychology was of high enough status and of sufficient quality to justify its receiving separate diplomate status with the American Board

of Professional Psychology, test subjects were needed. Virginia was one of two volunteers. She subjected herself to full board review including trying to show that it was proper for a school psychologist to present a tape and transcript of consultation with a school administrator, rather than a tape of a therapy session, as evidence for professional competence. Of the two test subjects, one passed--Virginia. School psychology, based on her competence and ability to show that it could be different from clinical psychology, achieved status nationally that it had not had.

Another difficult-to-document contribution I would like to get on record is that Virginia has done more, in my opinion, than anyone else in the country to make school psychology respectable to other psychologists. Whether one thinks that matters is another question, but her ability to move easily within APA through various committees, boards, and offices and to speak with enormous credibility and a fast tongue to the illustrious among American psychologists has been a major contribution to lowering resistance to school psychology's increasing credibility within APA. She has helped more than any others, I believe, to lay the groundwork for having school psychologists in high office in APA and for the many significant advances school psychology has made as a doctoral specialty in psychology.

Within the short time I have, let me mention a few other people who, I believe, have made exceptional contributions to school psychology nationally, working, as most often happened, out of state events and then moving on to the national scene. I hope I don't slight anyone by omission of names, but in preparation for this meeting, I did a quick check of names--how many people come to mind, as quickly as I could think of them--who, in my career, seemed to me to profoundly influence school psychology. In addition to the three already mentioned, there are many others, but in this short time let me say just a little about Donald Smith, Sam Bonham, Bill Farling, Mary Alice White, Susan Gray, and Dan Ringelheim.

Don Smith was the first editor of the *Journal of School Psychology*. He was at Ohio State at the time. While the establishment of a journal may not seem like much, it was. I had heard that plans were under way in 1962 to publish an *Ohio Journal of School Psychology*. I wrote to Don and suggested that it was time for a national journal. Don listened to me, and I assume to others who made the same suggestion, and a shoestring operation was begun in January 1963. Having our own journal--in real print, with real articles--for the first time gave school psychologists an opportunity to publish about our concerns without having to have our works filtered by editors who didn't know we had our own concerns and issues and techniques. Don nurtured that journal and helped it grow. He is no longer closely associated with school psychology; I don't know why. His reasons may be worth pursuing as part of the history of school psychology.

Sam Bonham was director of special education in Ohio until his retirement in 1982. In the early 1960s, he gave strong leadership to the development of school psychology in that state, helping to establish and subsidize a network of university training programs and field placements that made the Ohio training system, in my opinion, the strongest in the country. Sam does not have a doctorate. In the early 1960s when I spoke to the Ohio school psychologists association, I was told with some pride that there were only two doctoral school psychologists out of several hundred working in the schools. That nondoctoral state attitude, coupled with strong field-based and university programs supported by the Ohio

State Department of Education, was an important factor in the establishment of NASP. It was not by chance that Ohio has had such a prominent role in NASP's early development. Sam Bonham helped bring about that atmosphere.

Bill Farling was a stable guiding force in making NASP work in its early days. Also from Ohio, his leadership made it possible for NASP to weather personality differences, to get organized fast and efficiently, and to establish standards that were sensible at the time. His integrity and skill made friends out of enemies. Some people who helped to organize NASP, as will happen in any new major enterprise, did so because of promise of personal gain or because of personal hostility against APA. Bill, instead, as a major guiding force, came to the organization with concern for the future of the specialty, unsure about whether it would work, unsure about whether it was the best thing for school psychology. I know this to be true--and hope this is not saying things I shouldn't--but history will out. Before NASP began, we had occasion--in a bar--to talk at great length about NASP. My skepticism was obvious. As incoming president of Division 16 of APA, I saw it as a threat to school psychology's place in American psychology as represented by APA. Bill looked at all sides of the issue and made up his mind slowly, painfully, and carefully. Once committed, he helped build a strong NASP and I view him as having had a profound influence on making the Association work.

Mary Alice White at Teachers College, Columbia, and Susan Gray at George Peabody College for Teachers influenced those of us who are said to have influenced the field. Mary Alice influenced by her drive, political savvy, super intelligence, her textbook with Myron Harris, and her ability to intimidate me and almost everyone else by her persuasive logic. I hold her, more than anyone else, responsible for getting American psychology to accept the possibility of school psychology for diplomate status and for doctoral program accreditation, again allowing school psychology to break loose from a kind of second-class status in American psychology. Susan Gray, by virtue of her 1963 textbook *Psychology in the Schools*, the conference she sponsored at Peabody on internships, and her broad influence on leaders in American psychology such as Nicholas Hobbs, gave stature to the field at a time when it was just beginning to find its way as a separate specialty apart from clinical psychology.

Dan Ringelheim, first a school psychologist in East Orange, New Jersey, and then Director of Special Services in the New Jersey State Department of Education, helped conceive and develop a program for special services in New Jersey that influenced Senator Harrison Williams to propose what became P.L. 94-142. Dan moved to Washington, on leave of absence, to help implement P.L. 94-142 and died shortly thereafter of a heart attack. His work in New Jersey and his helping to influence a U.S. Senator to sponsor such a massive revolutionary bill has influenced all of us--for the good, one hopes, although in our field, it doesn't always feel that way.

This sampling of persons and events merely touches the surface of the kinds of activities in which many school psychologists engaged that influence what we do today. These people I've mentioned chose not only to do what they did on the job but also to work for their profession as part of what they did as professionals. I think in our specialty that is the prime requisite for becoming part of the history of the specialty--doing something extra for the sake of the profession and for that abstract concept--the betterment of children and schools.

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY IN NEW YORK STATE: FRAGMENTS OF A HISTORY

Gilbert M. Trachtman
New York University

I've been asked to recount the history of school psychology in New York State, and I have 15 minutes in which to do it. This is an impossible assignment. When I began to free associate to the topic, it became obvious I would need two to three hours merely to touch some of the high spots in our history. First, an objective history is beyond my capability. I *do* go back almost to Noah's Ark, but school psychology in New York State goes way back before me and I'm not a historian. Tom Fagan has knowledge of more dates and names and places than I do, even for New York.

Second, New York State school psychology has not only too long a history to talk about in 15 minutes but also too complicated a history. You've all seen the New Yorker's map of the United States which shows how provincial New Yorkers are about the rest of the world. In New York we even have a provincial concept of our own state. New York consists of upstaters and downstaters. Upstaters see New York as miles and miles of rolling hills, mountains, plains, valleys, farm country, and small friendly hamlets; an occasional big city like Buffalo, Syracuse, or Rochester; and way down south our state capital, Albany. Below Albany, they see a few more miles of distant suburb and then, just as New York State ends, at the Atlantic Ocean, a boiling, bubbling cauldron of sin and danger, New York City. Meanwhile we downstaters in New York City consider our town to be a garden spot of museums, theatres, concert halls, the United Nations, and Yankee Stadium, the veritable center of civilized earth surrounded by suburbia--Nassau County to the East, Westchester to the north. Further east we have potato fields, the ocean, and Europe. Further north is Albany, miles of primitive wilderness, and then Canada.

The history of school psychology in New York State is really three separate distinct histories: the history of upstate, the history of New York City, and the history of metropolitan suburban Westchester and Nassau County. I spent the '50s and early '60s as a school psychologist in Nassau County but my life before and after that period was in New York City--Brooklyn in the '40s and before, Manhattan for the past twenty years.

As the sketchiest of overviews let me tell you that New York City began to license school psychologists independently of New York State in the '20s and New York State began to certify school psychologists in the '30s. New York University probably had the earliest School Psychology program in the country, somewhere in that time period. New York City is exempt from New York State Education Department Certification procedures and so New York City licenses its own educational personnel, usually with standards similar to or higher than the rest of the state and including licensing examinations developed by the N.Y.C. Board of Examiners. New York City also established the Bureau of Child Guidance, attached to the city school system but separately funded, with mental health not education money. The Bureau contained a staff of psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers, and probably comprised the largest mental health clinic in the world. Long before Public Law 94-142, New York State had a strong commitment to special education with Boards of Cooperative

Educational Services serving suburban and rural districts which lacked their own programs, and, with this, had a long tradition of school psychologists employed throughout the state. The '50s were a period of great growth in our state but the growth took different forms in New York City, in upstate New York, and in Nassau County where I began my career. Upstate developed a more educational and psychoeducational model; both New York City and Nassau County developed a more clinical model, but New York City had greater room for diversity and exploration. It was my good fortune to participate in that exciting period.

In the '50s the greater New York City area was a stronghold of clinical psychology, psychodynamic and psychoanalytic in orientation. My training in a school psychology program was heavily clinical and, as my generation entered the schools, our job was to identify children for special class placement. We expanded the role from doing Binet testing for referral to special class placement to doing full psychodiagnostic batteries for referral to special class placement *and/or* psychotherapy. We were much more sophisticated about child psychopathology, and we gave teachers much more sophisticated reports for their files. As the upwardly mobile, highly educated, sophisticated middle class moved from New York City to the suburbs, demanding the best possible education for their children, the schools became increasingly mental health oriented and eager for this new clinically trained school psychologist. A Nassau County study of a 3-year growth period, from Fall 1952 to Fall 1955, showed an increase in school psychologist-pupil ratio from 1:7000 to 1:3000. By the late '50s, ratios of 1:1000 were found in many school systems while upstate schools were achieving ratios of 1:2000 or 3000 and New York City's Bureau of Child Guidance had a ratio of 1:100,000.

In the 1950s, I think Nassau County was the best place in the world for school psychologists to work. We grew rapidly in numbers. Given the great number of universities training school psychologists in our area, we were the most highly trained. We had the opportunity, if we chose, to expand rapidly in function.

Given the economy and the population we served, our clinical skills were valued and we often had the opportunity to shape or reshape our jobs. Many of us remained wedded to our clinical training and our diagnostic and therapeutic skills and continued for years to do what we had always done. Those who remained committed to their clinical heritage sharpened and refined their skills over the years and became leaders in their field, but most, eventually, left the schools and became directors or supervisors in clinics or psychiatric hospitals or entered private practice. A number of psychoanalytic institutes today, in the metropolitan and suburban New York area, include on their faculties many of my old school psych buddies from the '50s. Those who remained in the schools became more and more skillful and sophisticated about psychodiagnostic nuances and treatment modalities but continued essentially to test, write reports, and do some treatment.

Some of us, either more adventurous, more rebellious, or more responsive to the realities of the schools (or maybe just less satisfied with our clinical tools), began to experience dissatisfaction with our role and to explore new approaches. A list of the things we did, or tried to do, seems routine and commonplace today, but these were things we had not been trained to do and things which the schools did not expect or ask for. We did them haltingly, in primitive fashion, feeling our way, sometimes running back to the security of our Rorschach cards, but then

once again reaching out to try some new idea or something we had learned from a colleague. During the ten-year period from the early '50s to the early '60s I regularly completed less diagnostic batteries and reports than some of my more traditional colleagues, but I was able to try out many exciting new ideas. Several of us met regularly for lunch and compared notes about the ideas we had and the projects we were trying.

This is a list of my activities, culled from personal memory, but there were dozens of colleagues, all over Nassau County, who could report a similar list of activities. Most of these activities were not taught or discussed in graduate school.

1. Before assessing a child:

   (a) Reviewed school records

   (b) Met with referring teacher

   (c) Met with one or both parents

   (d) Observed child in regular class and at least one other setting

2. While assessing a child:

   (a) Included academic work samples in the assessment battery

   (b) Added Vineland Social Maturity Scale in cases of possible retardation

   (c) Conducted expanded interview with child as part of diagnostic procedures

   (d) Explored family conferences as a family dynamics assessment tool

3. After assessing a child:

   (a) Met with teacher and other school staff to review results and consider classroom recommendations and/or possible remedial recommendations, planned follow-up meetings

   (b) Met with parents to review results and consider possible home recommendations and/or possible referrals, planned follow-up meetings

   (c) Experimented with short-term family counseling

4. Beyond the individual child:

   (a) Began meeting informally with reading and speech specialists, school nurse, physical education teachers to discuss issues of screening, referral, the possibility of team work on particular cases, ideas for inservice and parent education, etc.

   (b) Taught inservice courses for teachers

   (c) Worked with parent association executive board in program planning

   (d) Spoke at parent association meetings, church, temple, and fraternal groups in town

(e) Ran a series of dad's nights for elementary-school fathers

(f) Ran short-term children's groups on various topics--behavior problems, teen-age problems, test anxious, sex education, college-bound

(g) Organized occasional parent groups--parents of retarded readers, expectant parents, kindergarten parents, parents of teenagers

(h) Taught high school psychology class

(i) Served on curriculum committees

(j) Served on report card revision committee

(k) Chaired committee on gifted

(l) Worked on school-community committee to establish a community mental health center

(m) Worked with local business people and tradespeople to develop job apprenticeships and work study programs for potential high school dropouts

(n) Consulted with administration on promotion-retention policies and on grouping policies

(o) Participated in preschool screening program for early kindergarten admission

(p) Taught adult education courses at local high school

(q) Published school psychology articles aimed at reaching parents, educators, and administrators, in journals such as *Educational Administration and Supervision, Phi Delta Kappan, National PTA Magazine, American School Board Journal, Exceptional Children,* and *Journal of Educational Sociology*

(r) Presented papers on school psychology to other professional groups--Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Teachers Association, Council of School Superintendents, Guidance and Personnel Association, Pediatric Society

(s) When a wave of educational reform hit the country after the Russian SPUTNIK, became actively involved with parents, faculty, and community in considering reforms such as nongraded, team teaching, specialist teachers, mini-schools, advanced college placement, and teaching machines and in helping to evaluate new programs

This is just a brief description of how some of us tried to change the day-to-day role of the school psychologist, but there is no time to talk about the larger issues: how we moved out from under special education funding to become part of the regular instructional budget, how we survived economic recession and budget cuts, how we became involved in some of the legal issues which are part of New York's history--the lawsuits by parents who demanded the right to see their children's records and the legal rulings and commissioners' regulations which foreshadowed the Buckley Amendment and some of P.L. 94-142's due process regulations.

So, in the briefest and sketchiest of overviews, I've tried to give you the flavor of one exciting time period in one of New York's three major areas, as some of us carried clinical psychological work to new heights and some of us tried to expand school psychology practice to new

breadths. I cannot speak about New York City's Bureau of Child Guidance where a totally different history unfolded. In the glorious '50s, although many psychologists were faced with ratios of 1:100,000 instead of 1:1000 and were spread so thin they could only visit a school once every few weeks, others pioneered many exciting programs before the Bureau was dismantled and psychologists were placed under special education as a result of P.L. 94-142. Nor can I speak of upstate New York where real rural school psychology may have first seen the light of day.

Nor can I begin to give you even a hint of the complex politics of school psychology in New York State except to mention the multiplicity of organizations which have developed and let you imagine for yourself, the resultant chaos. We have a state psychology association, a la APA with its School Division, a la Division 16; that's NYSPA. We have a state school psychology association, a la NASP; that's NYASP. Until last year, for many years we had a strong organization of upstate school psychologists--SPUNY, an organization of New York City School Psychologists--NYCASP, a statewide organization of trainers--SPECNYS, and an organization of clinical psychologists which many school psychologists joined--NYSCP. So I've already mentioned NYSPA, NYASP, SPUNY, NYCASP, SPECNYS, NYSCP--and I've not mentioned several major county organizations bigger than most state organizations, and a number of regional groups. We've even had to organize a Coordinating Council of School Psychology Organizations, COCO--and a local New York City coordinating group which we call LOCO-COCO.

School psychology groups organized sporadically over the years to fight the doctoral/nondoctoral issue but otherwise remained disorganized and unproductive until last year, when NYASP, the NASP affiliate, began to emerge as the statewide voice of school psychology. Many of us are hopeful that a new and more integrated history of school psychology in New York State is now beginning, but meanwhile, if you would really like to know the history of school psychology in New York State you must invite me back, have me bring a New York City and an upstate colleague, and give us three hours.

NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY IN PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph L. French
The Pennsylvania State University

I like to think that school psychology started in 1896. Some of those who are psychometrically inclined might think of that year as the birth of David Wechsler, on January 12. (To the cross-cultural psychologists, it should be of interest that he was born in Romania.) Others may think of 1896 as the year Alfred Binet co-authored a paper describing a projected ten-year study to produce the first practical test for measuring human intelligence, although he completed the project in fewer than ten years, i.e., in 1905. That is not the reason I pick 1896. That year, 1896, is the year in which school psychology was conceived. It was the year in which the Psychological Clinic was founded by Lightner Witmer at the University of Pennsylvania. Early University catalogs indicate that the clinic was founded for the study and treatment of mentally or morally retarded children and those with physical defects which slowed development or normal progress. In the early years, the Witmer clinic emphasized the study of mental retardation but gradually shifted to the study of normal and superior children and later to college students and adults with problems of mental health and vocational choice.

The clinic's first case, presented by a public school teacher, Margaret T. McGuire, involved a 14-year-old boy with problems in learning to spell. Most cases were of children thought to be mentally retarded. For one child with a speech defect, Witmer secured the services of a teacher of the deaf. He often sought other people in the community to provide the interventions suggested for the psychological diagnoses.

The clinic was started in March of 1896 and in the fall he addressed the four-year-old American Psychological Association about

> a new method of research and instruction which he called "The Clinical Method in Psychology and Diagnostic Method of Teaching". . . . He put forth the claim that the psychological clinic is an institution for social and public service for original research, and for the instruction of students in psychological orthogenics, which includes vocational, educational, correctional, hygienic, industrial and social guidance. (Collins, 1931, p. 5)

Witmer practiced affirmative action at the turn of the century. Anna Jane McKeog was his first PhD recipient in 1900, and eight of his first 25 PhDs were women.

In the years 1908-1910, a lot of things were happening to help shape school psychology. Child labor laws were passed, which kept children in school and out of the labor force. Teddy Roosevelt called for a much broader educational program for the 95 percent of the school population not well served. Three very influential books were published: *Choosing a Vocation* by Parsons (1909), *A Mind That Found Itself* by Beers (1908/1956), and *The Manual for Mental and Physical Tests* by Whipple (1910). The Binet-Simon scales were introduced in the US in 1908. These scales were not readily accepted by those functioning as psychologists. I have a 1914 publication of *The Psychological Clinic* from which I quote the opinions of several of the major forces of the time. DeCroly, who is

famous for the formboards he developed in Brussels, said, "In well-to-do quarters, children averaged higher (scores) . . . . This shows that one must reckon with variations in intelligence in different social classes" (Farrell, 1914, p. 43). Leonard Ayres of the Russell Sage Foundation said, "The tests are largely those of language efficiency; . . . native ability is not sufficiently tested, but rather scholastic and other attainments" (Farrell, 1914, p. 43).

J.E. Wallace Wallin of the University of Pittsburgh said, "I am quite certain that many diagnoses of teachers and nurses based clearly upon the Binet test will be very misleading, often humorously absurd, and at times pernicious. I base this judgment upon extensive use of tests on various types of children . . . . The diagnoses which I make after an exhaustive study of all the available facts are quite at variance with the Binet rating in a considerable percentage of the cases . . . . It should be remembered that mental testing is only one phase of mental diagnosis" (Farrell, 1914, p. 43). And Walter Fernald said, "Theoretically, the Binet test is of equal value in classifying cases of mental defect, but I have had 25 years of experience in the diagnosis and treatment of mental defect, and I have taught and classified thousands of these people, and it is not necessary for me or my assistants to use a Binet for classification. Nor do I believe that the Binet test would properly classify pupils for definite instruction or for detailed care" (Farrell, 1914, pp. 43-44). Seventy years later, in these halls, one hears the same comments being made. Similar comments were offered in the testimony for the Larry P. case. Once again psychologists are being called upon for professional judgments based on clinical interviews instead of being asked for scores based on tests from a limited list.

In 1925, Walter, a "Director of Psychological Measurements" in the New Rochelle schools, described the recent creation of an "office of school psychologist . . . to bring to bear upon educational problems the knowledge and technique which have been developed by the science of psychology" (p. 167). In describing the function of school psychologists, Walter identified five activities:

1. Direct all group testing within the system. Although teachers could give the tests and clerks could score them, he believed psychologists were needed to select and interpret them.

2. Conduct diagnosis and therapy of problem cases through assessment of intellectual level, emotional reaction, and history from parents and teachers. He expected psychologists to work with those suspected of mental retardation, those who were physically disabled (i.e., those with sensory, orthopedic, or speech disabilities), and those with conduct disorders.

3. Establish a constructive mental hygiene program in the school.

4. Bring a unique point of view to bear on educational problems and render contributions to the general theory and practice of education. Walter believed that although teachers and administrators were concerned with units of credit, courses, subject matter, and scholastic standards, psychologists could be expected to be concerned with the effects of specific procedures on the total development of the child. He suggested that the viewpoint could be presented either in formal meetings or in

"conversation" (which today might be spelled *consultation*) with teachers and principals concerning some specific point under consideration.

5. Conduct research.

Walter said it in 1925, and he might be quoted tomorrow: "A great deal of work remains to be done in the adaptation of psychological principles to the problems of our schools" (p. 170).

In the presidential election of 1932, it was Hoover versus Roosevelt, and it was Hoover who campaigned with the slogan, "A chicken in every pot and a car in every garage." The following year Percival Symonds addressed a meeting of the Association of Consulting Psychologists from a paper entitled "Every school should have a psychologist," which was published Saturday, September 9, 1933, in *School and Society*.

> It may seem ill-fitting to propose at this time the proposition that every school should have a psychologist when school jobs are being reduced and retrenchment is taking place on every hand. When cuts are found necessary in school programs special services are the first to go and the program of personnel and guidance is one of the first of these special services to be attacked. Without doubt at the present time the trend is in the direction of fewer school psychologists and less comprehensive psychological service. Every far-seeing person must realize, however, that the present trend is only temporary and that as society becomes increasingly interdependent, the need for special individual study and social control will become even greater than it has been in the past. If a psychologist has been found desirable to even slight extent in the schools of the past that need will become magnified in the future. (p. 321)

Although Symonds offered those comments at a meeting in New York City in 1933, they are very appropriate today--51 years later.

By 1936 there were 87 college- or university-based psychology clinics in the United States (Reisman, 1976). One of those was at Penn State, and its director was especially instrumental in the emergence of school psychology in association with special education. In 1931 Robert G. Bernreuter was brought to Penn State to start a psychoeducation clinic to facilitate the preparation of psychologists for the schools while providing services to children with learning disabilities and to college students who had personal adjustment problems or problems in selecting majors or in making vocational decisions. Bernreuter, a Stanford PhD, had Lewis Terman and E.K. Strong as advisors and had served an internship with Porteus. At Penn State, Bernreuter's teaching assignment included courses for teachers of exceptional children and several courses focusing on intellectual assessment.

In 1936 Frank Reiter, the psychologist in charge of the State Education Agency's bureau for special education, resigned and recommended Bernreuter to serve as his successor for the following year. Throughout the 1930s there were few psychological services available to school children. As a result, physicians were authorized to recommend placement of children in special classes for the mentally retarded. Since few physicians were prepared to make such a judgment, they relied heavily on the recommendations of teachers. One early act Bernreuter effected was to

secure the withdrawal of the authority of physicians to make recommendations for placing mentally retarded children in classes and to change the school code to authorize the school psychologist with that responsibility. Since there were few psychologists in the schools, except in major cities, and since legislators were a little apprehensive about the term *psychologist*, the title "Supervisor of Special Education" was created. According to Bernreuter, "Supervisors were not called psychologists because there is a separation of church and state." As he explained it, one powerful but slow-learning legislator believed psychology to be a religion, and it was easier to pick a nonpsychological term than to educate a legislator.

By regulation, instead of law, these Supervisors of Special Education were required to be certified as public school psychologists. Each county was required to have a Supervisor, i.e., psychologist, who would provide service to each school district and, when requested, to juvenile courts. The certificate was deemed necessary to assure that each child placed in a special education program had the psychological characteristics expected, as well as the educational need. The bill creating Supervisors of Special Education also required that every child not making normal progress in school be given an examination by a school psychologist. With few psychologists in the schools, criteria for certification by the Department of Public Instruction were drafted by Bernreuter and put in place to guide colleges and universities. With Pennsylvania and New York authorizing educational certificates for psychologists in the late 1930s, school psychology was born.

A number of psychologists who were active in the late '30s and '40s have told me about how influential Bernreuter was in securing the legislation. When I have asked Bernreuter directly about it, he has just smiled and remained silent. From his advisee Laura Murphy and others, I hear that he not only drafted the laws, but talked various legislators into cosponsoring them, rounded up votes for them, and than sat in the gallery late into the night to be certain that those who said they would vote, did vote and voted the right way.

In 1937, Supervisors of Special Education were mandated, and by regulation the position could be filled only by a person who held the certificate of a school psychologist. This was true until 1971. As we moved from the hybrid years to those of the specialty, on some occasions I believe we moved too far. Although I campaigned arduously for a Supervisor of School Psychological Services' Certificate and was delighted when this was obtained, the new requirements for a Supervisor of Special Education required absolutely no work in psychology. Today, supervisors of special education must hold a teaching credential in special education and take work in curriculum, law, and supervision, but nothing in psychology.

From the 1938-39 *Penn State College Bulletin* comes this quote: "The student may choose to take a general major in psychology, or may choose to specialize in (a) Business and Industrial Psychology; (b) Clinical Psychology; or (c) School Psychology. Before graduating a student must complete not less than 24 credits in psychology." The required courses for business and industry included 421 (applied), 471 (measurement of intelligence), and electives. The required courses for clinical were 471, 476 (psychometric technique: Binet), and 477 (psychometric technique: nonverbal). For school psychology the required courses were 14 (educational), 471, 476, and 477.

Laura White Murphy was Penn State's and Bernreuter's first doctoral recipient with an emphasis in school psychology. She graduated in 1936 and for many years was County Supervisor of Special Education and Chief School Psychologist in Delaware County just west of the city. She retired from active duty three or four years ago. Other early school psychology doctoral recipients were Rutherford Porter, who recently completed a distinguished career at Indiana State University in Terre Haute, and Eugene McDonald, who recently retired as Research Professor Emeritus at Penn State. Porter was the first certified school psychologist in Indiana.

Lightner Witmer started the Pennsylvania Association of Clinical Psychologists in 1933. He was the first president in 1934-1935 and had another term in 1935-1936. Bernreuter followed as president in 1936-1937. The association's newsletter, *Clinical Psychology*, was first published in June 1936 under Bernreuter's leadership and carried a banner headline concerning clinical psychologists and psychiatrists. The second issue in January 1937 headlined psychological services for the public schools. Ten of the first 16 presidents were school psychologists or professors associated with programs preparing school psychologists. The Association of Clinical Psychologists disbanded during World War II and was reactivated in 1946-1947 as the Pennsylvania Psychological Association.

With Mary I. Elwood, a school psychologist in Pittsburgh from 1931 to 1962, as president of the state association in 1952-1953, the Divisions of School, Clinical, and Business/Industrial were created. School psychologists Mae Warfield and Jack Birch were the first presidents-elect of the school and clinical divisions.

With the formation of divisions, school psychologists were not frequently found in the presidential chairs of the association for the next twenty years. This became an increasing concern to those of us active in school psychology. A dozen or so of us had been invited by the Department of Education to Harrisburg for a few days to offer comments about education and training standards or some such issue. After one day's work was completed, we melted ice cubes well into the night. After tiring of war stories, we started thinking of the future, and what should be done about leadership in the Pennsylvania Psychological Association (PPA). While our counterparts in New York, New Jersey, and Ohio were starting separate state school psychological associations, we decided to stay with the Association and beat the system with the system.

I confess that as a relative newcomer to the state, I was a passive discussant but strong supporter of the action which emerged. Since the association meetings were held in June when most school budgets were expended and the work load was heavy, few school psychologists attended the annual meetings. Yet, it was at these meetings that those present voted for the officers of the association. It was decided to nominate, from the floor, Richard Hess, a former school psychologist, who was at that time in charge of the Millersville State College School Psychology Program. Those who regularly attended the PPA meetings were astounded to see such a large attendance at the spring meeting. Dick was duly nominated and overwhelmingly elected. That action spoke louder than words. The bylaws were revised, a mail ballot mandated, and all members of the association now have the opportunity to vote for the price of postage. Since Dick Hess took office in 1971, eight of the last thirteen presidents have been school psychologists.

Pennsylvania was one of the last states to enact a licensing law. Although proposed by Bernreuter in 1937, it was not enacted until 1972 when Dick Hess, the Professor-in-charge of a nondoctoral school psychology program, was president of the association.

REFERENCES

Beers, C. (1956). *A mind that found itself.* Garden City: Doubleday. (Original work published 1908).

Collins, J. (1931). Lightner Witmer: A biographical sketch. In R.A. Brotemarkle (Ed.), *Clinical psychology: Studies in honor of Lightner Witmer to commemorate the thirty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the first psychological clinic.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Farrell, E.E. (1914). A study of the school inquiry report of ungraded classes. *The Psychological Clinic, 8,* 29-47.

Parsons, F. (1909). *Choosing a vocation.* New York: Agolton Press.

Reisman, J.M. (1976). *A history of clinical psychology.* New York: Wiley.

Symonds, P. (1933). Every school should have a psychologist. *School and Society, 38,* 321-329.

Walter, R. (1925). The functions of the school psychologist. *American Education, 29,* 167-170.

Whipple, G.M. (1910). *The manual for mental and physical tests.* Baltimore: Warwick & York.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY IN NEW JERSEY

Virginia Bennett
Rutgers University

Part of the education of my own children was a large, wooden puzzle map of the United States. New Jersey became known to my family as "the peanut state," because in this big puzzle it was almost exactly the size, shape, and even the color of a peanut.

This tiny state, which has recently been plagued with the stigma of gambling, its attendant Mafia and tarnished politicians, and being a corridor of gas tanks between New York and Philadelphia (not true, the tanks are only as far south as Linden), is the most densely populated state in the Union. Despite this fact it boasts beautiful rural countryside; it has forests, wildlife preserves, mountains, streams, rivers, fresh water lakes, and a long coastline of beautiful beaches. It stands high among its sister states in the production of farm goods and in horse breeding, as well as being highly industralized. It supports large numbers of bedroom communities, having commuters to New York or Philadelphia.

New Jersey had more battles fought on its soil than did any other state during the American War for Independence. It validly supports more "Washington slept here" signs than anywhere else (except perhaps Mount Vernon in Virginia) and shared, briefly, along with New York and Philadelphia, having the nation's capital (this was at Princeton, when Congress feared an assault from unpaid soldiers). It boasts one of the oldest remaining hand-hewn, wooden-shingled churches in the United States at Shrewsbury.

It ranks third, second only to New York and California, in what it spends per capita on public school children (alas, it jockeys for lowest place among state expenditures for higher education). New Jersey's interest in education was expressed early with not one, but two, colonial colleges (Princeton and Rutgers) among America's nine.

If I sound a bit biased, I am. My grandfather's great-grandfather was born in New Jersey in 1749, and so was I--a few years later. I am completely a product of public education in New Jersey: elementary, high school, bachelor's and graduate degrees. Please note, I refer to my home state as New Jersey, not New Joisey.

Pennsylvania rightly claims that Witmer's University Clinic in 1896 was the real beginning of school psychology (Cutts, 1955), and Connecticut continues to boast that they hired Arnold Gesell as the first school psychologist in 1915 to make "mental examinations of backward and defective children" (Cutts, 1955). As both these ventures dealt with those we now call "educationally handicapped" school children, I propose to add a New Jersey claim to Pennsylvania's and Connecticut's antiquity. In 1847, the New Jersey Statutes, Chapter 4, provided for instruction of "Indigent Deaf and Dumb Persons, Inhabitants of this State," while Chapter 5 provided for the Instruction of Indigent Blind Persons.[1]

When Arnold Gesell was doing his "mental examinations" in 1915, he was using a new instrument, not the Stanford-Binet published in 1916 that made Lewis Terman famous, but an instrument that came out of little old New Jersey. In 1910, psychologist Henry H. Goddard of the Training School at Vineland, New Jersey, translated the 1905 Binet Scale, and in 1910

published a revised Binet-Simon, developed and refined by use with 2,000 Vineland public school children and the Vineland Training School populations. (Goddard, 1910)

Psychologists, physicians, social workers, and teachers were invited to attend Goddard's lectures on the administration and use of the tests. There was no thought of restriction upon those who used the tests, and hundreds--primarily teachers--attended these lectures. Maybe New Jersey can be blamed for originating the idea that early school psychologists were teachers with a Binet, and not even a kit. Imagine buying a Binet in those days for fifteen cents!

These Goddard graduates used the Binet test to determine "backward and feeble-minded children" (in the terminology of the day) for the purpose of offering them special education services--which weren't too comprehensive at the time. Those who were eligible for residential placement, at such places as Vineland, received care and instruction. Several schools scattered throughout the state were providing, through the laws of 1911,[2] classes for the retarded and for slow learners, the latter under various euphemistic names, even then avoiding labeling. One such frequently used name was "opportunity class."

The Training School at Vineland was a resource for psychological research with and concern for children during those years. One of Goddard's trainees went on to found Pennsylvania's famous Devereux School; another conducted a study of a peculiarily isolated group of New Jersey residents we knew as "Pineys." Today they would be called "Appalachian," but they became famous as the Kallikaks. The inferences drawn from the research may have been faulty, but research was being conducted and attention was being focused upon children with learning problems.

Edgar Doll was another Vineland Training School researcher. The Vineland Social Maturity Scale originated in New Jersey in 1935 and was certainly the first and has remained a durable measure of adaptive behavior.[3]

As was true throughout the nation, the work of psychologists during World War II and the mental hygiene movement emphasized and brought to public attention the effects of personality functioning and social adjustment upon school learning (Bardon & Bennett, 1974). As in other states, concerned New Jersey parents, supported by educators and psychologists, sought a sympathetic listener in the State Legislature.

Either New Jersey parents were especially well organized, or there were more New Jersey parents who had children with special needs than there were in other states, but the entire nation is indebted to some very dedicated parents whose names are lost. They appealed to Senator Alfred N. Beadleston who adopted their cause and introduced and obtained passage of a series of laws that have borne his name in New Jersey. These laws served as a prototype for laws in other states and eventually became the model for Public Law 94-142, but more of that later.

The first Beadleston Act was in 1946, Chapter 63, Section 4 of Title 18, New Jersey Statutes.[4] It provided a grant of $2,350 per year to any school district that maintained a special class for the mentally retarded. This legislation was permissive, not mandatory, but $2,350 in 1946 was a powerful inducement. Between 1946 and 1954, many districts

established special classes. Classes had before existed, as I mentioned, but as was true in other parts of the country, these were usually in the cities and supported partially by city school budgets.

New Jersey then and now adheres to the colonial grassroots form of school district organizations. We currently have 611 separate school districts, each with separate budgets, school boards, and administrators, each reflecting its own community. This legislation encouraged the "boondocks" to establish such classes. I was a kindergarten teacher in one such "boondock," and the parents of a severely retarded six-year-old girl were pushing the school for her entrance into public education. My wise--but, from my point of view, sadistic--principal recognized that admitting this girl, who was actually trainable, would serve as a wedge for starting a special class under our school's auspices. I found myself attempting to handle a physically large child who was completely nonverbal and unsocialized and whom I could keep from battering the other 25 children only by a firm grip on her hand to keep her by my side at all times. She was, of course, pathetic, I was ignorant, and we all suffered. The principal won her point, however, and our class for trainables (TMR) was started. Our class became *the* class, not only for special children in our own school district, but also for those of neighboring districts.

In 1954, the State Department of Education approved a certificate for "Psychological Examiners of Mentally Retarded Children" under Chapter 178 of the New Jersey Law of 1954.[5] This professional was authorized to carry out the now (as of 1954) mandated provision for retarded children between the ages of 5 and 20. A milestone in legislation, it defined Educably Mentally Retarded (EMR), Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR), and "Neither Educable nor Trainable" and further ruled that school districts employ a psychologist for the purpose of such classifications.

Now that psychological services were required, not merely permitted, a need had been created for trained *school* psychologists. C. Winfield Scott, then Director of Graduate Studies at Rutgers and long an advocate of high caliber psychological services for school children, enticed J. Richard Wittenborn, a well-known clinical psychologist and researcher from Yale University, to establish a doctoral program in school psychology. Dick Wittenborn was instrumental in the promulgation and adoption of a new certificate, that of school psychologist, requiring 60 graduate credit hours plus supervised experience. The first doctoral students were admitted to a labeled and organized School Psychology Program at Rutgers in 1955. Recently, I asked Dick Wittenborn (who is still at Rutgers) how he managed to get such stringent--for the times--requirements through. He grinned and said, "With great difficulty." He admitted that the presence of Kirk Seaton, a psychologist in the State Department of Education at the time, had helped. This certificate, adopted in 1957, was a model for the nation at the time, but it was Jack Bardon who worked for the New Jersey two-and-one-half-year certificate to become so widely promulgated as the minimum standard for entry level to school practice.

"Beadleston" legislation proliferated. Classification of children as Emotionally and Socially Maladjusted and provisions for special classes for these children were only briefly permissive. By 1959, they were mandated.[6] In 1957 my kindergarten class, again at the behest of my principal, incorporated another "special" child. This was a child from another district sent to our existing class for Trainables, but one the teacher of that class claimed was very unusual, very different--beautiful, nonverbal, and subject to tantrums for no detectable cause, but somehow not

"Trainable." An examination with a clinical psychologist was arranged. I read the report which told me what I already knew--how she behaved. The rest was gibberish--to me. However, if she didn't fit with the Trainables, we'd try her in my regular kindergarten. The word "mainstreaming" had not yet been coined.

I had no idea how to handle this child. I discovered she had fears of certain objects, and I couldn't figure out why. Her tantrums were ear-splitting, but she didn't hurt others; she ignored them; she ignored me. There was no eye contact. If she wanted something, she took me by the hand and led me to it. Of course, you guessed it, but I was baffled and afraid of doing something terrible to her. There had been one provocative term in that psychological report, "autistic-like behavior." I hurried to the Rutgers Library (years before computer searches, of course) and turned up a number of articles on childhood autism by one Leo Kanner. Kanner wrote that it was best if these children could be incorporated within regular classes. I relaxed, went back to my little girl, and "incorporated" her. I had never heard of mainstreaming, least restrictive environment, or successive approximation and shaping behavior. I "invented" those techniques as had many teachers before me. I also had confirmed for me that kindergarten children are helpful, cooperative, understanding, sensitive to the needs of others, and accepting of individual differences leading to differential treatment.

But back to our friend Beadleston. By 1966 the laws included 11 categories of classifiable learning handicaps and introduced the Child Study Team Concept, another New Jersey first to be mandated. Despite the Team Concept's drawbacks, it was developed and still serves to provide for balance and breadth of information and decision making about a child.

As services other than classification were not required by law, most school psychologists were expected to spend their time on the individual assessment of intelligence and personality--and they did. School psychologists were not employed to be therapists or researchers. An unusual funding pattern for psychological services in New Jersey in the 1960s--50 percent of the psychologist's salary was reimbursed by state funds (see Footnote 6)--permitted some districts to supply sufficient services to enable school psychologists to consult with teachers, meet with parents, and see children for individual or group counseling (never called "therapy" in our public schools). The quality, quantity, and ratio of psychologists to pupils varied widely among New Jersey's 611 school districts--and still does.

By 1958 Wittenborn's research interests necessitated his withdrawal as director of the school psychology training program at Rutgers. The school administrators in New Jersey were under pressure to conform with the law requiring school psychology services, and Rutgers was the only state institution in New Jersey with authorization to offer graduate training beyond the master's degree.

The pressure upon Rutgers to train school psychologists became enormous. Large numbers of applicants to the headless program were accepted as part-time students. C. Winfield Scott, now chairman of the Department of Educational Psychology, was very favorably impressed by a young psychologist who was working in the Princeton public schools and who had been teaching some courses for Rutgers as a co-adjutant. It was obvious that this young man not only was knowledgeable about psychology in the schools, but had all the qualities--although I'm not sure Win Scott

then realized this--for becoming an extremely effective administrator. Win Scott finally lured him away from Princeton to Rutgers in 1969, and the new faculty member turned the disorganized mass of students he inherited into a small, cohesive program. His name is Jack I. Bardon.

Among the some 111 part-time students, one was admitted in 1960 as a full-time student, a woman whose children were already teenagers and whose work as a group leader for child study under the auspices of the State Department of Education had led to her being offered a Grant Foundation Fellowship for doctoral training. I started in 1960. Jack had just joined the faculty to coordinate the School Psychology Program, and Win Scott suggested that since this new faculty member was to be my advisor, I should make an appointment to see him--which I did. When I first saw him, I thought an undergraudate student had somehow blundered into the wrong office. I soon learned that this "kid" had a lot on the ball and wasn't quite as much of a kid as I had thought. Jack is an exacting teacher and role model. I learned from him that psychology in the schools is a specialty area that cannot be confined to testing and labeling kids in a single school district and that really caring about what happens to kids in schools means doing something about school programs, about what is happening in the state legislature, in training programs, in the federal legislature, and getting the power of the American Psychological Association to back the work of school psychologists.

Universities respond to "popular" programs. The time was ripe to expand the school psychology faculty, and my frantic determination to finish my doctorate within the period of my funding made me available to fill a new position at Rutgers. "B&B," as we became known in New Jersey, became the school psychology team.

The name of Jack I. Bardon has been synonymous with the history of school psychology since 1960 in the nation, as well as in New Jersey. He developed the program at Rutgers on the basis of his experience, recognizing the importance of high standards of training and practice. His enthusiastic belief in school psychology and his dedicated and persistent efforts--through his writing, his speeches, and his active participation in APA--have led to national recognition of school psychology as an important practitioner-scientist specialty. During the 1960s the continuing demand for school psychologists led other New Jersey colleges and universities to plan training programs. It was apparent that the Rutgers programs alone could not meet the need without sacrificing quality for quantity, and we weren't about to do that.

In 1966, the Rutgers faculty (B&B, that is) and the faculty of three other New Jersey institutions of higher education, two public and one private, established a consortium of school psychology training, so that we could build a cooperative training program with uniform standards. At the time, no state college was authorized to offer training beyond the 30-graduate-credit master's degree. The then Office of Education, fertilized by the Johnson administration's Great Society policies, made possible grants for upgrading professionals in education. I honestly think both Jack and I have written more words for grant applications than either or both of us have written for publication. There were meetings in Chicago and elsewhere, "selling" school psychology to educators and battling blizzards to get home to students and classes. But eventually, there was the promise of a cool half million dollars to stipend students

and to provide for expanded libraries, equipment, and faculty at the other three institutions as well as our own. The number of graduates eligible for certification quadrupled, yet all the training programs and those that have followed in New Jersey have maintained high standards of training.

New Jersey had another good friend of school psychology. Daniel Ringelheim, who had headed school psychological services in East Orange, became Deputy Commissioner for Special Education in New Jersey and developed comprehensive Rules and Regulations to interpret the New Jersey laws. He moved from New Jersey to the Office of Education in Washington, DC. I realize that the reaction of school psychologists to Public Law 94-142 is mixed, but it was primarily Dan Ringelheim who defined that law's intent as well as shaped its contents, modeled after the existing New Jersey laws. Dan Ringelheim's untimely death has been a loss to both New Jersey and the nation.

As early as 1963, Jack and I were convinced that the typical Boulder model of scientist-practitioner training did not adequately prepare professional psychologists (school or otherwise) for actual practice, and we have since then consistently promulgated training programs that emphasize the integration of academic work with actual practice and the need for applied research as part of practice (Bardon & Bennett, 1967; Bennett, 1976; Bennett & Bardon, 1979). In New Jersey, our point of view about training was shared by many practicing clinical psychologists. To make a long story short and to gloss over a difficult political battle, we in New Jersey established the first graduate school within a major university devoted to the appropriate training of practitioner psychologists, clinical and school. These programs had another related goal: The programs included places to offer already practicing and certified school psychologists an opportunity to enter a doctoral program that built upon their previous knowledge and experiences to provide new and meaningful knowledge and experiences. With complete absence of humility, I proudly contend that our professional program at Rutgers has become the model for professional psychology training nationwide.

There are many other New Jersey firsts--the first Diplomate in School Psychology (ABPP), the first school psychologists to serve on *several* major boards and committees of APA, many firsts to serve the State Department of Education and the Office of Education, a training program among the first to be recognized for excellence by NIMH and APA. Three New Jersey school psychologists have been presidents and many have served on the executive committee of Division 16 of APA, and we now claim for New Jersey, in 1984, the first school psychologist to be nominated for the presidency of APA, Jack I. Bardon.

FOOTNOTES

1. New Jersey Statutes of 1847, Chapter 4, Chapter 5 (Deaf, dumb, blind), provided for $5,000 "general fund" to educate all such children in New Jersey.

2. New Jersey Statutes of 1911, Title 18, Chapter 234, was the first specific piece of legislation to locate, identify, and program for children with handicaps, who were defined as blind, deaf, or retarded, and were "three years or more below normal."

3. The title of the 1984 revision of this scale is the *Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales.*

4. New Jersey Statutes of 1946, Title 18, Chapter 63, Section 4, provided for classes for the mentally retarded and made monies available to districts.

5. New Jersey Statutes of 1954, Title 18, Chapter 178, Chapter 179, provided for three categories, "EMR, TMR, and neither EMR nor TMR".

6. New Jersey Statutes of 1959, Title 18, Chapter 104, added provision for "socially and emotionally maladjusted" children and provided reimbursement (50%) for expenditures for services.

7. New Jersey Statutes of 1966, Chapter 29, extended services for all eleven categories of handicapping conditions, defined and provided for special classes.

REFERENCES

Bardon, J.I., & Bennett, V.C. (1967). Preparation for professional psychology. *American Psychologist, 22,* 652-656.

Bardon, J.I., & Bennett, V.C. (1974). *School Psychology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bennett, V.C. (1976) Applied research can be useful. *Journal of School Psychology, 14,* 67-73.

Bennett, V.C., & Bardon, J.I. (1979). Research as practice in professional psychology. *Academic Psychology Bulletin, 1,* 29-34.

Cutts, N. (Ed.). (1955). *School psychologists at mid-century.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Assocation.

Doll, E. (1935). The Vineland Social Maturity Scale. *Training School Bulletin, 32,* 1-7, 25-32, 48-55, 68-74.

Goddard, H.H. (1910). A measuring scale of intelligence. *Training School, 6,* 146-155.

SECTION IV - THE HISTORY OF STATE ASSOCIATIONS OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

In this section attention is focused on another aspect of the history of school psychology, namely, the development of state associations of school psychologists. Whereas the previous section focused on the broad history of school psychology in different Eastern states, the focus in this section is upon the specific history of an individual state association. Edna Harrison is among those best qualified to document the first ten years of the history of the Kansas Association for School Psychologists (KASP).

The history of KASP has been selected as an example of what was happening in school psychology at the state level for two reasons: (1) in that state good records were maintained in the form of newsletters, minutes of meetings, and other important historical documents and (2) KASP, being neither the first nor the last state association of school psychologists to be formed, being neither the largest nor the smallest in the nation, followed a pattern of development similar to many other states. The efforts of KASP to document important historical events in Kansas may encourage other state associations to undertake similar study. As foreword, some information may be helpful in order to situate KASP's history within the broader context of the history of school psychology within that state.

The regulatory beginnings of school psychology in Kansas can be traced to the initiation by the State of reimbursable programs for school psychologists in 1954. By 1956 there were eight school psychologists employed in Kansas schools. Meetings for these school psychologists were periodically called by the State Department of Public Instruction to discuss issues relevant to the profession. One of the most hotly debated issues at that time, according to Dean Lichlyter,[1] was whether a school psychologist should be trained as a clinical psychologist or whether one should have a teaching certificate with two years of experience as a teacher in order to be eligible for a school psychologist certificate. Very often the positions taken by individual school psychologists were reflected by their membership in either the Kansas Psychological Association, which later developed a Committee on School Psychology, or in the Kansas State Teachers Association, which was an association for those with a teaching background but which offered no representative programs specific to school psychology.

In 1960 the fifteen school psychologists working in Kansas schools decided to form their own association. According to Dean Lichlyter, first president of the group, this initial association had a very loose structure. No constitution was written, no committees were appointed, and no dues were assessed. It was agreed that meetings would coincide with those called by the State Department of Special Education, but no other meeting dates would be stipulated. It was also agreed that the president and the secretary-treasurer would be elected for an unstipulated term of office. George Marker succeeded Dean Lichlyter as president in 1962 and Patricia White served as secretary-treasurer for the duration of this association's existence, 1960-64.

In 1963 a number of events took place that ultimately had impact on the formation of KASP. In that year W.E. Gifford published his master's thesis entitled *A Survey Examination of the Status, Training, and Role of the School Psychologist in Kansas*, at the State College of Pittsburg. The thesis was based on responses from school psychologists as well as from school superintendents regarding issues that dealt with school psychology. The survey indicated a lack of agreement, even among school psychologists, regarding role definition. The paper received widespread attention not only because of the evidence it presented but also because of its call to broaden the professional role of school psychologists in order to serve more children.

A second important event was the publication on March 4, 1963, by the State Department of Public Instruction of a paper entitled "Role of the School Psychologist." By attempting to describe the role, the type of training needed, and the extent of services provided, the paper provided a new sense of identity for Kansas school psychologists.

A third important event in that year was a letter from Paul Ackerman, the State Department's Director of Psychological Services, which summoned all school psychologists to a meeting at Kansas University on November 16, 1963. To ensure good attendance, two distinguished speakers, Dr. Louis Fliegler and Dr. James J. Gallagher, had been invited to present papers on the topic "Education of the Gifted." Although Ackerman's letter appeared to call for a more clearly delineated professional identity for Kansas school psychologists, separate from the Department of Public Instruction, no specific direction was suggested in the letter. As a result many school psychologists left that November meeting in a state of confused uncertainty. Nevertheless, it was decided to review during the winter months the constitutions of various state associations of school psychologists and to form a committee to prepare the first draft of a constitution for a new association of school psychologists in Kansas that was about to be born.

FOOTNOTE

1. Dean Lichlyter, who once described himself as the "oldest school psychologist in Kansas both in tenure and in years," has been one of the primary sources on early psychological services in Kansas public schools.

EDITOR'S NOTE ON THE AUTHOR,
EDNA L. HARRISON

Edna Harrison began work in the Kansas schools in 1920, when she was seventeen, with a State Normal Training Certificate earned in high school. Three years of teaching followed . . . then marriage and mother of three . . . and then back to school at age forty-three while teaching full-time in the Wichita schools . . . graduating, cum laude, from Wichita University in 1949 with a double major in education and psychology. In 1960 she received a master's degree in Elementary School Counseling from Columbia University. After further coursework in Kansas, she received state certification in school psychology in 1963 and later worked in the Wichita Schools' Diagnostic and Resource Center until her retirement in 1971 at age 70. She served as program chairperson and president-elect, 1970-71, and as president, 1971-72, of the Kansas Association of School Psychologists of which she was a charter member. KASP has awarded her a special plaque and honorary life membership for "outstanding service to the field of school psychology." At age 82 she prepared--and typed--the concise synthesis of KASP's history for this monograph.

THE FIRST TEN YEARS
OF
THE KANSAS ASSOCIATION FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS
1964-1973

Edna L. Harrison

1964

It was at the Spring Meeting of Kansas school psychologists, called by action of the State Department of Special Education, that the Kansas Association for School Psychologists (KASP) was formed. The conference was held at the Kansas State School for the Blind at Kansas City on May 22, 1964. At 9:00 a.m. the group assembled in the auditorium for a demonstration-lecture on "The psychometric aspects of intellectual evaluation of the blind and partially seeing," by Dr. Hal Ginsparg, a professional with wide experience. At 10:45 a.m. another demonstration-lecture-discussion, "Non-standardized methods of psychoeducational evaluation and rapport establishment," with Dr. Walter Kass, was held.

After noon was a session with a client assigned to each school psychologist for testing and evaluation, followed at 3:00 by a film, discussion, and summarization of experiences and activities with clients.

After the dinner hour a time was set for a "possible meeting of the 'Kansas School Psychologists' Association.'" Sometime between 7:00 and 9:00 p.m. the beginning of a professional organization to be called "Kansas Association for School Psychologists" was formed under the sanction of the Director of School Psychological Services in the State Department of Special Education. A great deal of thought and preparation had gone into the plan, as was evident in the materials put into the hands of the charter members. Those prominent in the preparation were Patricia White, who served as temporary chairperson, and George L. Cooper, who was elected chairperson of the new organization. A constitution had been prepared and was approved by the thirty-one charter members. The 1964-65 officers also included Ted Smith, president-elect, and Roberta Harkness, secretary-treasurer.

The conference continued until noon on the following day and was adjourned after a lunch at the School for the Blind. Observers at the sessions were Drs. Beatrice Wright and William Trussell of the Menninger Foundation. Observer and cosponsor of the conference was Mrs. Clara Robertson, Director of Programs for the Visually Impaired, State Department of Public Instruction.

1965

The Spring Meeting of 1965 was held at a workshop jointly sponsored by the Parsons State Hospital and Training Center and the Kansas Association for School Psychologists. Dr. Henry Leland, coordinator of the Parsons Project, was instrumental in setting up the workshop, which would be but one of many conferences to be held throughout the Project's duration. Some of these would be concerned with sheltered workshops for the retarded, with training children in adaptive behavior, with auditory problems, and with music therapy.

The KASP workshop consisted of discussions on the classification and evaluation of retarded children in the schools, problems relating to the training of school psychologists, adaptive behavior and school psychology, and community mental health and school psychology. Dr. Donald C. Ferguson, Coordinator of Student Personnel Training at Kent State University in Ohio, gave an invited address on "Training in School Psychology."

The purpose of the Parsons Project was explained in Dr. Leland's talk on the second day of the workshop. It had seven basic objectives:

1. Continued development and evaluation of approaches to communication behavior of retarded children,

2. Investigation of learning and retention processes of retarded and normal children,

3. Investigation of language development of retarded and normal children,

4. Investigation of social interaction of retarded and normal children in laboratory situations,

5. Investigation of social behavior of retarded children in natural groups,

6. Application of research findings and approaches to the development of improved treatment and training procedures for retarded children, and

7. Extension and expansion of existing research in leisure activities.

Work relevant to those objectives was currently in progress in two other settings besides the Parsons Center--the University of Kansas campus in Lawrence and the U of K Medical Center in Kansas City. In both of these locations the work pertained to normal children as well.

One edition of *PROJECT NEWS* carried comments on "Adaptive Behavior and School Psychology," in preparation for Dr. Leland's Saturday morning talk. In it he noted William Gifford's master's thesis, *A Survey Examination of the Status, Training, and Role of the School Psychologist in Kansas*. He noted that since school psychologists in Kansas spend the greatest portion of their time in psychodiagnostic work, they are very much involved in the search for an instrument which will provide both diagnostic and remedial procedures.

In his address, Dr. Ferguson stressed that school psychologists should be using projective tests to provide more information concerning students--not to become test centered, but to serve persons who have problems. Therefore, they must be selective, from a repertoire of projective techniques, in choosing the one needed for each particular situation, putting the child before the instrument.

However, Dr. Leland, noting Dr. Sanders' remark that people in Kansas are not ready for projective "lingo," said that school psychologists must be trained in projective techniques in order to be able to understand reports, not necessarily to use them. In the same vein, Mr. Dan Smith,

chief psychologist at Parsons Training Center, commented that one must be careful to understand when "we're using ourselves as projective instruments" as well.

Dr. Leland also suggested that the school psychologist look for (a) what's healthy in the child, (b) what can be built on, and (c) whether the child can be returned to the teacher with suggestions for his curriculum or should be referred to an agency. Mr. Smith agreed, saying that information must be processed and decisions must put the processes together, that early prevention of certain conditions that cause retardation can have reversing effects upon brain damage in the child.

Dr. Stan Mahoney, quoting from *Transactions Magazine*, spoke of the "mystique" of mental health: (a) people are no more accepting of behavioral deviates than they were 100 years ago and (b) there is a lack of concern, and there are patterns of rejection. Does the affluent society, he asked, buy its way out by another segregated program? Toleration is better than punishment--but acceptance is necessary, and the administrative and organizational barriers must be swept away. Flexibility must be developed in children flowing from one community group to another. What, he asked, is your community doing to help isolates work into community integration? What happens to special education students after elementary, junior high, high school?

As a survival point, Dr. Leland suggested that teachers need to look for positive qualities, to teach the qualities lacking, and to define what needs to be done with a child so he can take the next step, in church, home, or school. Why not change our notions of treatment, why not group children according to adaptive behaviors? How do we get the child back into the community? They agreed that mental health is Kansas' big business.

During the summer of 1965, Dr. Leland drew together persons from the Kansas Psychological Association (KPA) and the Kansas Association for School Psychologists, and representatives from School Psychology Training Programs to discuss (a) training programs and accreditation standards, (b) school psychology and its relationship with education, counselors, state research centers, and professional psychology; and (c) the role of the school psychologist.

Discussion later turned to the scrutiny of Senate Bill No. 46, in which Section 44 laid restrictions upon the usages of the term "psychologist." But Section 44 (i) provided that nothing in the act should be construed "to restrict the use of the term 'school psychologist' by any person who is certified as a school psychologist by the Kansas State Department of Public Instruction."

A by-product of the KASP spring meeting was a dialog with Dr. Ferguson concerning bringing a program to the 1966 Convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) on the work of school psychologists in elementary schools. The symposium presented, "Areas of Multi-Approach to Problems in the Elementary School," attracted the attention of a great many conventionists. To take a program to the APGA Convention meant that the discussants, mostly psychologists, must avoid overemphasis on "psychology." A larger room had to be provided the crowd who attended, 35 of whom gathered that evening to discuss further with the program initiators the work with elementary schools.

The result of a questionnaire sent out to Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, and six other states in the southwest resulted in a called conference at Texas University, Austin. Dr. T. Ernest Newland held sessions on May 7 entitled "Southwestern Regional Institute for School Psychologists' Studies in *The School Psychologist*" and "*The School's Commitment to Society.*" Two Kansas school psychologists, Pat Williams and Edna Harrison, attended.

Early in the fall of 1965 the Kansas Legislative Council requested the KASP president, George Cooper, with others from the same organization, to meet with its research department in Topeka on October 1, with regard to Proposal Number 6--Exceptional Children. This was announced as a broad study to determine the proper policy for providing appropriate educational services. The study included the nature and content of the program, its administration, and its means for its financing, for discussion had arisen in the legislature as to future costs and whether actual funding complied with the law's intent. The conference was to be oral and informal. The guests would present their statements and lead into a general discussion.

KASP members who attended were George Cooper, Robert Lowe, Edna Harrison, David Brecheisen, and Roberta Harkness. Statements were presented by George Cooper and Edna Harrison. It was the consensus of members that this recognition by the Legislative Council added both to KASP and to exceptional children's status.

A letter from the president of KASP to all school psychologists gave November 4-5 as meeting dates for the Fall Meeting. The program was arranged at the Kansas State Industrial Reformatory (KSIR) in Hutchinson. The schedule called for an orientation and tour of the reformatory and a presentation by Mr. Charles McAtee, the Director of Penal Institutions, on policies and practices in Kansas penal institutions; a panel presentation on the juvenile offender and the community; and a Friday morning half-day session with Dr. Jackson R. Day, psychiatrist at the Boys' Industrial School in Topeka.

The panel members included the Judge of the Reno County Probate Court, the Juvenile Officer of the Hutchinson Police Department, the Probation Officer for Reno County, and a representative from the Kansas Employment Service. Another highlight of the meeting involved interviews of KSIR inmates, one to each pair of school psychologists. That experience was one of the larger values received from the sessions. KASP pledged twenty dollars for books to the KSIR library.

On Friday afternoon the school psychologists met with Mr. Gary Adamson, Director of School Psychology Services, Kansas State Department of Education, to discuss possible proposals for grants under Public Law 89-10. Several pilot programs were developed in Kansas schools during the ensuing year, notably the Education Modulation Center at Olathe, a program under the auspices of Ray Fenley at Colby, and the Diagnostic and Resource Center at Wichita.

Soon after the fall meeting, the first committees for KASP were formed: the Legislative Committee, Robert Lowe, chairperson; the Membership Committee, William Gifford, chairperson; and a Program Committee for Future Meetings, chaired by David Brecheisen, president-elect. Being considered was a Professional Relations Committee to work with KPA in the School Psychology Study Group.

A communication from Dr. Donald Ferguson stated that President George Cooper had been elected to a two-year term on the Board of Directors of the *Journal of School Psychology* of which Dr. Ferguson was managing editor. KASP was the owner of one share in the magazine. With that appointment came the task to serve as regional promotional representative of the *Journal* in Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Colorado, and Wyoming.

Mr. Cooper, a man of purpose in good public relations, had been meeting at various times with Gary Adamson to discuss the state office support for the young organization of KASP. Specifically, they had discussed the fall meeting plans and other KASP activities.

1966

A message from Mr. Gary Adamson designated May 11-13 as Spring Meeting dates. It was to be held at Olathe School for the Deaf and the Children's Unit for Rehabilitation at the University of Kansas Medical Center, jointly. The consultants were to be Mrs. Mary Mira of Kansas City and Dr. C.P. Boetzinger of Olathe. This meeting was called by the Division of Special Education. The KASP business meeting was to be held at 6:00 p.m. on May 12 at the Western Hills Motel.

In a letter dated January 28, 1966, a placement service made available by the *Journal of School Psychology* was announced. Roberta Harkness, secretary-treasurer, announced a total of 58 school psychologists in the state of Kansas.

It was in 1966 that the Cooperative Diagnostic and Resource Center was initiated in Wichita under government grant. Two psychologists, KASP members Mildred Price and Edna Harrison, were included on the staff. The objectives were (a) to identify and serve handicapped children and youth; (b) to diagnose, evaluate, and provide consultative services; (c) to improve teacher competence in meeting educational needs; (d) to enable teachers to meet those needs by gaining more insights into methods and materials; and (e) to bring about greater racial sensitivity among personnel, parents, and children in the low-income areas. After a pilot period it was to become an established asset to the school community under local funding.

The KASP constitution was revised November 4, adding Section 2 to "Membership" for student affiliates; in Article IV, a Legislative Committee was added to the role of officers; in Article VII, Section 2 was changed to read, "Dues are payable on or before the regular fall meeting . . . If dues are not paid on or before the fall meeting, all rights and privileges of membership are forfeited"; and a Section 3 was added, "Dues for affiliates shall be three dollars a year."

The Fall Meeting was scheduled for November 3-4 at the Girls' Industrial School in Beloit. This was also a called meeting by the State Department. There were 68 psychologists listed in KASP files at the beginning of the school year, one diagnostician, and one psychometrist.

The first Board Meeting with President David Brecheisen was held on August 31. The board approved the time and location for the Fall Meeting, to be held in conjunction with the State Department, nurturing the young KASP. Also approved were the third Monday of each month during the school year for board meetings and the purchase of *Robert's Rules of Order*. Edna Harrison was appointed parliamentarian for the year. Clarification of the

roles of committee chairpersons was discussed, as well as the roles of counselors and child development specialists as they affected those of school psychologists.

In a letter dated September 30, Mr. Brecheisen wrote: "We are very pleased to have a School Psychology Consultant, Kenneth Armstrong, in the Division of Special Education this year. He replaces Gary Adamson who is now working in a doctorate program at K.U."

1967

On January 16, 1967, a letter was sent from KASP Publications Committee Chairperson Cynthia Olson concerning an incidence report of exceptional children in Kansas. This report indicated the percentage of children in Kansas needing special services. "The school psychologists in Kansas," she wrote, "are vitally interested and trained in working with all school administrators toward establishing programs for these exceptional children." The letter, sent to the Superintendent of Schools in all Unified School Districts, extended an invitation to contact KASP to discuss questions about such programs.

In this letter, Mrs. Olson urged members of KASP to read the report prior to the business meeting Friday evening so that the goals and purposes of KASP could be included in the next revision of the constitution. In the minutes of the Executive Board Meeting the statement was made that the above communication "is for the purpose of explaining the service that a School Psychologist offers."

At the sixth Executive Board Meeting communications from Dr. Henry Leland and from Kent Garhart formed the bulk of discussion. Yet it was decided that the KPA-KASP School Psychology Study Group should clarify the position regarding those communications. (This group held their first meeting at the Special Education Center in Salina on January 28.)

It was decided that the Spring Meeting of KASP would be held at the Diagnostic and Resource Center in Wichita April 27-28. Other meetings planned for the spring were a Conference on Mental Retardation, offered jointly by the State Department of Social Welfare and Fort Hays Kansas State College, and a seminar in School Psychology for one hour's credit at the University of Kansas, with Dr. Marvin Fine, which would take a look at current issues and trends in school psychology, what the functions ought to be, new innovations, behavior therapy, and diagnoses of disabilities with the goal of remediation.

A bill requiring psychologists to be certified by a state board of examiners was introduced in the legislature. The Association for School Psychologists was to keep members informed about the bill.

On March 7, 1967, Dr. Marvin Fine wrote a letter, published in the KASP *Newsletter*, in which he described the role of the school psychologist as contrasted, or in some situations replacing, the work of the counselor in the schools. However, he found a place for both, but defined the articulation of both roles more precisely than had probably been done heretofore.

Volume I, No. 8, of the *Newsletter* carried an announcement of the Spring Meeting, and registration materials and a program were enclosed.

The newsletter also announced a workshop in school psychology sponsored by Kansas State College of Pittsburg, Dr. Rumford, correspondent. It would include a leading school psychologist from another state and an administrator of a system that employs school psychologists, and it would involve no fees or college credit.

Two other announcements were made in the same newsletter. On January 27 the bill on the certification proposal was sent to a subcommittee for some revisions. "It now appears," wrote President Brecheisen, "that this bill will probably become law. The Executive Board did not feel this proposal would interfere with our present functioning, but we do not whole-heartedly support this bill either." The bill was approved on April 15, 1967.

The Kansas Psychological Association held its annual state meeting at the Parsons State Hospital and Training Center on April 14-15. On April 15 there was a panel discussion on "School Psychology: Who, What, Why, When, Where, and How."

Volume I, No. 9, of the newsletter included a questionnaire on school psychology that was prepared by Bessie Whitehead and her committee. The State Department Special Education Division's newsletter, *A Typical Report*, for May 1967, carried a page on the "Optimal Learning Climate for Each Child--Goal of Kansas School Psychologists."

Robert Lowe assumed the office of president when the Spring Meeting went into its business session. His first newsletter (Vol. II, No. 1) was principally concerned with the Fall Meeting in Topeka, first at the Kansas Neurological Institute, then at the Kansas Treatment Center for Children, and ending at the Menninger Foundation on Friday. There was a tour of each. Speakers were a member of the staff at KNI; Mr. Onan Burnett, principal, Dr. George Inge, psychiatrist, and Dr. William Miller, psychologist, at KTCC; and Dr. Marvin Ack at Menninger's. The banquet was held at the China Inn. Dr. Everett Greenwood, psychiatrist at the School Mental Health Division of the Menninger Foundation, also spoke.

1968

Volume II, Number 2, of the *Newsletter*, printed January 10, 1968, gave news of the Executive Board meeting of November 2. It was proposed that a committee be appointed to revise the constitution and that another committee be set up to develop a code of ethics. President Lowe announced that a telegram from KASP had been sent to Senator Pearson urging full funding of the state education program for special services.

Accompanying the newsletter was a summary of Bess Whitehead's timely questionnaire concerning training, role, and problems of the school psychologist in Kansas. Seventy-five questionnaires had been sent; 47 were returned. In her report she wrote that the questionnaire was an outgrowth of the fall 1966 KASP meeting:

> At this time we had a panel of professors from the various state colleges and universities who were in charge of training school psychologists. It was quite evident that there was no coordination or communication between the several institutions. There was much uncertainty as to what the program of training should be and even what, exactly, school psychologists were actually doing in the

public schools. Moreover, the psychologists seemed almost as uncertain as the professors as to their role and as to what they considered a desirable training program for future psychologists. A great deal of dissatisfaction was voiced concerning the inadequacies of past training and with programs for future training.

As stated in the questionnaire, our hope was that this project would stimulate thinking about our role, our training and our profession in general. We also hoped that it might furnish the beginnings of some guidelines for those planning training programs for future psychologists. Furthermore, we hoped that this would be only a beginning of our investigations . . . .

Thirty-three of the 47 favored a National Association of School Psychologists. Miss Whitehead wrote:

It appears that the results show that the 47 school psychologists feel that our job is both educationally and clinically oriented. We feel responsible for working with learning problems and their alleviation. We evidently see ours as a distinct profession, both educational and clinical. We want and plan to continue our training in both areas so that we may function adequately in the public schools.

We seem to be leaning toward working with groups (teachers and children) where this is practicable, but we are not forgetting the need for working with the individual. We are aware of the value of prevention of problems as opposed to trying to "pick up the pieces." We hope to increase our "preventive" function.

For further study, it would probably be valuable to attempt to get an evaluation of our efforts from teachers and administrators. We probably need to improve our services in many ways. Also, we may need to further educate these people as to our abilities--and our limitations. We need to see ourselves as others see us--and to show others the image we want them to see.

It may be valuable to share the results of this poll with those in charge of the training of school psychologists. They need to know what we want in further training, what we think valuable for beginning psychologists, and how we regard our early training. Of course, our ideas certainly need further thought and consideration, but this can be a start. No one knows better than we what our job demands and what we need to do the job. As an organization working toward a well-planned goal we can influence future programs.

At the January 25th board meeting, President Robert Lowe read a letter from the Ohio School Psychologists Association inviting KASP to send delegates to a meeting in Columbus March 21-22. It was to be an exploratory meeting to study the possibility of establishing a national organization for school psychologists. It was suggested that the State

Department of Special Education be contacted in regard to sending our delegate. Robert Lowe was chosen as delegate.

The Spring Meeting was held May 2-4 at the Educational Modulation Center in Olathe. Later in the year the full report of the Spring Meeting was published by that Center. The topics presented included: "Some Current Issues in School Psychology," "Different Ways of Looking at Behavioral Management in the Schools," "Behavioral Procedures Used with Junior High Students," "Math Remediation Through Operations," and "Analysis of the Verbal Interaction Between the Teachers and Students in the Elementary Classroom."

The Fall Meeting was held at Salina in conjunction with a Convention of Guidance Counselors on Friday, November 1. The principal speaker was Dr. William Glasser whose book on *Reality Therapy* had inspired the conception for the meeting. His subject was "Reality Therapy as Defined in the Public School."

1969

The January *Newsletter* began with the announcement of the First Annual Convention of the National Association for School Psychologists (NASP) to be held in St. Louis on March 14-15. Our only representative from KASP was Robert Lowe, who was elected chairman of the membership committee of NASP.

The main speaker for the KASP Spring Meeting was Dr. James McCarthy from the University of Wisconsin. The problem of learning disabled children was becoming more and more apparent in the schools. The international Association for Children with Learning Disabilities had been initiated by a group of parents and some professional persons in 1963. Their first convention was held in 1964, and in 1966 a large number of school psychologists had attended the third annual convention, held in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Dr. McCarthy's presentations were on that subject under the title "Learning Disabilities and Language: Some Considerations."

The newly elected president of KASP, Kent Garhart, established a schedule of monthly meetings of the Executive Board, most of which were held in the Education Building in Manhattan and later at the Ramada Inn in Salina. He encouraged the idea of beginning plans for the fall meeting in late May before the close of the school term. The invited speaker for the fall would be Dr. William Farling, Executive Director of the newly formed National Association of School Psychologists.

The next Spring Meeting would be early because the Council for Exceptional Children, with whom KASP shared speaker Dr. Leo Buscaglia, had set their date to accommodate his schedule. Dr. Buscaglia's topic was "Love as a Behavior Modifier, Or, Love in the Classroom."

Dr. Gary Adamson, who attended the NASP meeting in March, brought back to KASP a suggestion for the appointment of a new committee chairperson. The new committee was to be called the Planning and Development Committee. It seemed a natural follow-up to the inspriational NASP Convention and Dr. Adamson was appointed chairperson. Letters were exchanged with Edna Harrison, newly elected president of KASP, in which areas needing improvement in school psychology were discussed. One of these was the need to give more attention to the improvement of status.

1970

The KASP *Newsletter* for January/February 1970 carried a statement from its editor/publisher, Cynthia Olson: "At the rate that news is coming in, we are going to have to drop the 'news' from the KASP *Newsletter*." However, the publication continued.

As temporary representative to meetings of the Kansas Association for Mental Health, Edna Harrison reported that their Social Action Committee supported a request of the Kansas Psychological Association seeking their endorsement of legislation that would enable psychologists to receive insurance compensation for treatment of patients in Kansas; that a requested $350,000 for state support for community mental health centers was deleted from the governor's budget request for fiscal 1971; and that architects were still working on plans for replacement of adolescent cottages at Topeka State Hospital.

Ron Willis, chairperson of the Professional Standards Committee, had sent questionnaires concerning proposed changes in KASP membership requirements to be marked and returned as soon as possible. Cynthia Olson requested that questionnaires from NASP be returned forthwith to Dr. Hoedt. The *Newsletter* also contained minutes of the Executive Board. It was indeed a short *Newsletter*! In this year, Dal Cass was elected Kansas delegate to NASP, 1970-72.

1971

The resignation of John Jones as president-elect had caused the president, Edna Harrison, to assume the leadership for the Fall Meeting. Her letter to Dr. Gary Adamson, liaison between KASP and the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), written September 19, 1970, carried the following message concerning the program for the Spring Meeting which was to follow in 1971: "This is to let you know of latest developments regarding the Spring Meeting. John Jones has resigned and Kent Garhart is taking over the responsibility for the Meeting. He will be contacting you."

However, another low blow! Just before the first Executive Board Meeting of the new year, a letter was received from Kent Garhart, who had become program chairman for the Spring Meeting, telling of his inability to assume that position. His letter was read at the Board Meeting where, as past president, he was presiding. Ronald Willis and Nancy Thompson were elected to chair the Program Committee in his place.

Included in the *Newsletter* were news items from various school psychologists at Hutchinson and Wichita, much of which concerned the use of perceptual-motor training in the schools. Their findings indicated that such training was valuable, particularly when started at the kindergarten level. (See "Real Help for Perceptually Handicapped" by Edna Harrison, *The Grade Teacher*, April 1969). Two school psychologists were using group guidance sessions, sociometric methods, and predictive testing methods, while another worked with a multi-disciplinary team, including a diagnostician, a materials and learning specialist, an experienced substitute teacher, and a perceptual-motor therapist, in giving inservice training to primary teachers in Hutchinson.

At this point, schools everywhere were going through the throes of examining the role of the school psychologist. In Wichita the problem

was bordering on the crucial. The school administration, therefore, set up a task force to study that role. One of the results of the study was a list of "Responsibilities of a School Psychologist."

At the April 2 Executive Board Meeting, the question of the necessity of getting written permission from parents for psychological testing of their children was raised. An opinion was to be gotten from the state attorney general about the matter. KASP as a whole was not yet ready to relinquish what many felt was their unique area of responsibility to superintendents of schools without a thorough study of the very broad range of possibilities--not to mention probabilities--that might be triggered thereby.

At that time, the first certificates of membership were procured by Ron Willis, chairman of Professional Standards, and distributed to the members. Also, for the first time, letters were written to the psychological trainers in the various colleges inviting them to become honorary members of KASP. Plans were discussed and report made of preparations for the Spring Meeting to be held in Topeka.

The Kansas Psychological Association sent invitations, including copies of the extensive program, to KASP members to their annual meeting to be held at Overland Park. One of the special interest groups was given over to school psychologists, with James Ryabik, Fort Hays State College, chairman, and panel members Clifton Wolf, Richard Sweetland, and Harold Converse.

The name of Dr. Converse brings to mind the many ways in which he gave support and encouragement to KASP through the years. Other college trainers were helpful participants: James Ryabik, Marvin Fine of Kansas University, and Dal Cass of Emporia State, who also worked at the national level with NASP.

As a follow-up of the study mentioned earlier, the school psychologists in Wichita received a set of *Observations and Comments Concerning the School Psychologist*, beginning with definitions of legal, professional, district, and personal aspects of the role of the school psychologist as seen through the eyes of the school administration. It ended with the suggestion that a description of the school psychologist should be in the line of psychoeducational consultant and brought together the various functions expected of a psychologist in the schools.

The KASP *Newsletter* for April carried further information concerning the Spring Convention and business meeting in Topeka. In it were "whispers in the wind of a big Fall Workshop--Regional." More about that later.

Dr. Marvin Fine, in his presentation of current issues, spoke of the school psychologist's mode of consultation, contrasting the non-facilitative with the facilitative. He quoted Carl Rogers' positive regard for getting the psychologist's idea across to the teacher, that what she or he does is worthwhile. What is needed, he said, is empathy for him or her, a feeling of one's understanding of teachers' feelings.

Through years past, the standing Committee on Professional Standards had been thoroughly reworked from an ordinary membership committee into a usable method of upbuilding the Association and thereby enhancing the

profession. A similar breakthrough was accomplished when the old Ethics Committee became the new Ethical Practices Committee. A revised Code of Ethics was the outcome.

The third standing committee, *Newsletter*, became the Publications Committee under the hands of Cynthia Olson whose newsletters came with firm regularity. James Ryabik, Fort Hays State College, was appointed Legislative Committee representative by the Kansas Psychological Association's president, Dr. Jeanne P. Fish. Referring to legislation being considered at that time, she wrote, "The group most likely to be affected by this legislation (to extend certification to non-Ph.D. psychologists) would be the school psychologists, of course . . . ." Mr. Ryabik, in turn, notified the president of KASP and asked for information and suggestions that would help him in carrying out his responsibilities. The reply mentions some of the ideas and problems facing school psychologists in general and suggests other persons to whom he could write for further information.

At this time, Robert Lowe, West Central Regional Director of NASP, resigned his position with the NASP Board of Directors and Cynthia Olson replaced him with the consent of the board. Mr. Lowe was a charter member of NASP and had been the first to hold the office of Membership Chairman and Kansas delegate when NASP was organized in 1969 at the convention in St. Louis.

The method used to contact persons for the NASP Regional Meeting failed to bring many from out of state. Only a half dozen or so made their appearance, so that the meeting was, after all, mainly KASP members and visitors. Even though Ruth Dukelow received a few state directories and sent out many letters, there was no feeling of responsibility toward a Regional Meeting under the auspices of NASP. The list of states contacted included the neighboring state of Colorado (though not a member of the Western Region) making an even dozen.

KASP seemed to be in the throes of new development during 1971-72. The voluminous correspondence was an indication. The coordination of the KASP constitution and its bylaws with those of NASP was approved. At that point, there had been no separation of the bylaws from the constitution.

1972

President Lowell Wolfer opened the 1972 year with a letter of exuberant greetings for the new year and went immediately into the announcement of plans which included announcement of an Executive Board Meeting following the meeting of school psychologists called by the State Department for January 26. For the Spring Meeting it was decided to explore the possibility of the combined meeting with McPherson College and Prairie View Mental Health Center at McPherson.

The *Newsletter* for March carried information on the Spring Meeting. Dr. Glasser was to hold a "Workshop on Education and Psychology in the Identity Society" beginning March 23 at 9:00 a.m. and ending at 3:00 on March 24, when the KASP Spring Meeting would continue with the business meeting of the total Association, from 3:00 until 4:30.

The National Association of School Psychologists had grown extensively in the three years since its founding. It now had a Washington office and had established an insurance coverage program. The membership from Kansas had grown to 107, which entitled it to 3 votes in the assembly. It was announced that Fred Miller was to be the new West Central Regional Director from 1972-74.

Signs were appearing under the new KASP administration that KASP was becoming interested in promoting accountability and further competence in the interests of education. Norman Tibbitts, who became president as the slate of officers was voted in, spoke to that concept when he asked the members to be thinking about what school psychologists are going to do in the future to make an impact upon education.

When the Western Kansas Psychological Association met April 27-28, Mr. Don Rickstraw presented issues that were to be pursued with KPA when its committee under the chairmanship of James Ryabik was to meet. These issues included the question of the availability of confidential matter to other than psychologists, why a written examination would be necessary to meet certification requirements, and whether KPA would support APA in the matter of accepting master's level psychologists. It was felt that the last should be a career ladder approach.

WKPA recommended to KPA the following levels:

1. Sub-Doctorate, with 2 years of supervised experience,

2. Master's level with the same, but add 3 years' experience,

3. Doctor's Degree, no extra experience,

4. Specialist, with Doctor's Degree plus 2 years' experience, and

5. Associate of Arts to be established with 1 year's experience.

KPA had the "legislators' ear" and was in a position to recommend the above.

A problem discussed was that there were no guidelines for supervision, that a closer look was needed, and that it must become more meaningful and pertinent to certification or competencies. Another problem identified was that sub-doctoral level psychologists cannot work after hours privately for a fee.

The summer of 1972 brought out the first *Newsletter* with Marvin Fine as editor. He called for papers for the Fall KASP Conference since a part of the program was to be devoted to reports on completed or ongoing projects of possible interest to school psychologists. The "child advocate" movement was gaining momentum on a national level.

The *Newsletter* carried the minutes of the brief Executive Board Meeting. The "Question of the Month," a section which Dr. Fine originated, concerned the problem of building the child's self-esteem through an innovative in-class program.

A proposal to be considered was an offer from the State Department of Special Education to set up a workshop for school psychologists that would focus on evaluating the visually handicapped child. It was now 8

years since a workshop had been given in that area at the School for the Blind in Olathe and Kansas City (at which time the Kansas Association for School Psychologists had been initiated). Mrs. Phyllis Ellis of the State Department would conduct a referendum among the members to ascertain their interest.

The *Newsletter* also congratulated Lowell Wolfer on being elected the delegate assemblyman from Kansas to NASP, 1972-74. Dr. Fine was elected alternate.

The Fall Convention of KASP was held in Lawrence and was one of the most informative. The President of NASP, the late Calvin D. Catterall, PhD, was the Friday morning speaker. A panel of experts and small group discussions followed. His subject was "The New World of School Psychology."

Four papers from various school psychologists and educators ranged from work with the gifted pupil and the learning center, through use of human figure drawings, to teachers' feelings concerning work with the school psychologist. A Saturday morning workshop on "Advising Teachers" rounded out the program.

1973

The February *Newsletter* carried the minutes of the Fall Meeting of 1972, held at the Kansas University Student Union in Lawrence. Matilda Funderburk's motion that a letter of appreciation be sent to Dr. Farling for his work and contribution to NASP had been well received and carried. In response, Dr. Farling expressed appreciation and his reluctance in stepping down as executive director, but he felt that an executive director should be in the Washington office on a full-time basis. The *Newsletter* also carried the minutes of the February Board Meeting, noting that it was moved that Edna Harrison, recently retired, be honored at the Spring Conference. The motion carried but was not implemented until a later date.

Handbooks for KASP executive board members were discussed and the responsibility was turned over to Dr. Fine's committee. It was during his chairmanship of the Publications Committee that many innovations were both discussed and implemented by the Association.

NASP travel coordinator, Bud Swanson organized a Geneva, Illinois, Travel Service for the purpose of obtaining reduction in fares to the NASP Convention in New York. The NASP newsletter also contained a copy of the new constitution.

The October *Newsletter* carried the Business and Board Minutes for March 23, May 30, and September 14 and included a revised membership application, a note from the president, and a farcical tragicomedy on one of the Stanford-Binet items, cleverly indicating a burlesque outcome.

The next Business Meeting in March, at the Holiday Inn, Topeka, reported a membership total of 92 members. Dr. Harold Converse, president-elect for KPA, extended a convention invitation for March 30-31 and explained reasons why KPA and KASP need a close working relationship.

Plans were made for a second Regional Conference, a workshop on "Practice in Innovations for School Psychologists," to be held at the Prom Town House in Omaha, Nebraska. It was announced that the next NASP Convention would be scheduled for Las Vegas.

Minutes of the March KASP Convention included a full financial report, a resolution on "Parent Permission for Testing and Placement" for consideration by the membership, and the proposed budget for 1973-74. The *Newsletter* opened with the announcement of the Fall Conference and Workshop for which an outstanding consultant had been obtained--Dr. Joan B. Chase, Director of Special Education, College of Medicine and Dentistry, Rutgers Medical School. She was to discuss means of enlarging the psychologist's repertoire in order to deal with the handicapped child in the school situation. There would be group activities, video-tapes, selected films and, hopefully, a visit to the State School for the Visually Handicapped.

Notice was received of the Second Southern Professional Institute to be held June 14-16 for the second time at the University of Texas at Austin under the leadership of Dr. Thomas Oakland.

So ends "The First Ten Years"--a history of the Kansas Association for School Psychologists, its origin and development. The next years must be written, if not in ink, by the ongoing and ever more zealous achievements of those dedicated to the best for children.

APPENDIX

THE CENTER FOR THE HISTORY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

Thomas K. Fagan
Memphis State University

Background

The idea for a Center for the History of School Psychology (CHSP) evolved from my personal interests in the development of professional school psychology. Such interests were expressed in the gathering and dissemination of bibliographies related to school psychology in the past two decades. In my travels among the state associations as president of the NASP (1980-81), I was surprised to learn of the lack of information and understanding of school psychology's development among practitioners in the field. The same practitioners, however, seemed highly receptive to such information and when provided with it were surprised to learn of the origins of certain activities and their relationships to current events and professional issues. While several sources of historical information related to school psychology were in existence (e.g., APA Division 16, NASP, and several archival agencies), none were then undertaking systematic study of the profession's development. It was for this principal reason that the Center was originated.

Purpose and Activities

The primary purpose of the Center is to provide a source to facilitate the systematic study of the development of school psychology, the relationship of that development to other areas of professional practice in both psychology and education, and to relate in a meaningful way such development to current issues, events, and practices in school psychology. The Center will attempt to fulfill these purposes without becoming overly redundant with other agencies having similar purposes. As presently conceived, the CHSP is not intended to become a museum or repository for interesting artifacts related to the development of school psychology. Other agencies exist for such purposes and most such items would be better given them. Thus, while the development of educational and psychological tests is central to the development of school (and other) psychology, such items are best maintained by the Buros Test Library at the University of Nebraska. While the establishment of the APA and NASP are important events to the history of school psychology, the correspondence and other related material surrounding such events and people are best maintained by the respective associations or related agencies (e.g., Archives of the History of American Psychology).

The CHSP is interested in locating the sources of such information and reviewing it for purposes of obtaining an integrated history of school psychology. For example, the collection of Hall's correspondence maintained by the archivist at Clark University is most revealing toward gaining a better understanding of Arnold Gesell, reputedly the first person in the United States to hold the title "school psychologist." Some of this correspondence is in the CHSP simply because it was purchased (copies are available from Clark U at very reasonable rates) as part of a research project on the origins of the term *school psychologist*.

In order to serve as a facilitating resource, the CHSP is engaged in certain projects that of necessity involve the accumulation of material. These include:

1. the acquisition of a complete collection of books written specifically on or about the profession of school psychology. Approximately 35 such books have been acquired, and with the exception of a few recent books of related content (e.g., psychological consultation in schools) the collection is considered near completion. Some arrangements have been made with a book publisher and individuals to obtain copies of new school psychology books as published.

2. the acquisition of a complete collection of journals written specifically on or about the profession of school psychology. These include *Journal of School Psychology*, *Psychology in the Schools*, *School Psychology International*, *School Psychology Review* (formerly *Digest*), *The New Jersey Journal of School Psychology*, *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice* (formerly *Professional Psychology*), Division 16 Monographs, and new journals such as one on school services to be issued this summer and the proposed *Journal of Professional School Psychology* to be published by Division 16 in the future. In some instances arrangements have been made for copies to be deposited to the Center upon publication.

3. the acquisition of newsletters of Division 16 and NASP. A near complete set of NASP newsletters is maintained and the Center is still searching for back issues of those from Division 16.

4. the acquisition of information regarding the development of training programs, state associations, state certification and licensure, and other developments.

5. the gathering and maintenance of correspondence with many persons significant to the field of school psychology or having information significant to the field. Such correspondence has been conducted with Jack Bardon, Willard Nelson, Joe French, Polly Alexander, Norma Cutts, Louise Bates Ames, Seymour Sarason, George Speer, Marie Skodak Crissie, Paul Eiserer, Ernest Newland, Rutherford Porter, and many others. Such correspondence serves to clarify the events and meaning of certain events in our history.

6. the gathering or oral history via tapes of meeting presentations or cassette recordings made by selected school psychologists. A recently completed two-hour video-taped session with the Illinois School Psychologists Association is an excellent example of the potential in this area.

7. the acquisition and maintenance of proceedings of all major national and regional conferences related to school psychology.

8. the acquisition and maintenance of photos from recent and early events in school psychology history.

9. the acquisition and maintenance of the vita/photos of selected individuals in the field of school psycholgy.

10. the compilation of a professional bibliography spanning the period 1890-1983. This project is now in its second year and should be completed by late summer and subsequently published by NASP in early 1985.

Related to its general purpose, the Center also encourages state associations and the national associations to initiate formal procedures for maintaining and studying their individual and collective histories. This may be done through correspondence or through the presentation of history-related programs at state and national conventions. The Center is also conducting publishable research projects some of which are nearing completion.

Structure and Facilities

At present, the CHSP is nothing more than a working idea of its director. No separate facility exists other than my office and all records, correspondence, and other matters are conducted and maintained by me. This has been done during the period when I was teaching a course on the history and control of school psychology at Virginia Tech University (1982 and 1984). I am assisted in these efforts by graduate assistants when available. The bibiliography compilation would have been impossible without such assistance. Since the Center avoids becoming a museum/repository for many things, the entire current collection could be easily stored in two file cabinets. The formal incorporation of the Center is yet to be accomplished but will be in the coming year. This will necessitate additional structure which will facilitate acquiring information and conducting research. It is also anticipated that with completion of several of the projects mentioned above and acquiring duplicate copies of many texts, journals, and other related materials, the Center will be able to make available to training programs and other groups a lending library for local study, research, or display.

Additional copies of this bulletin may be ordered from:

CURRICULUM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
Statesman Towers West
School of Education
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

Other bulletins currently available:

CULTURAL AWARENESS AND READING
READING: GREAT EXPECTATIONS
READING: FOCUS FOR ENJOYMENT
RHYTHM, RHYME, AND REASON
THE READING ENVIRONMENT
READING CHALLENGES: NEW DIRECTIONS
A PAGEANT IN READING

ACTIVITIES FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MATHEMATICS ENRICHMENT
ALTERNATIVES TO TESTS, MARKS, AND CLASS RANK
THE AMERICAN INDIAN: A TEACHING-LEARNING UNIT
THE ARENAS OF POWER: FOCUS ON SCHOOLING
BLACK PEOPLE IN AMERICA: A TEACHING-LEARNING UNIT
CURRENT ISSUES IN SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

CURRICULAR TRENDS IN INDIANA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN INDIANA: ANALYSIS OF THE C-1 RULE AND CAPPS
CURRICULUM IN ENGLISH I: OPTIONS, GOALS, CONTENT
CURRICULUM IN ENGLISH II: PLANNING AN INTEGRATED UNIT
A DEVELOPING CURRICULUM IN ENGLISH
THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THORNS AND THREATS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION IN INDIANA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
IMPROVING TEST TAKING SKILLS
INDIANA HISTORY TEST: FOURTH GRADE
LEADERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE EVALUATION OF LEARNING
LEARNING ACTIVITY PACKAGES
LEGAL ASPECTS OF PUPIL EVALUATION

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION IN INDIANA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MINORITY ETHNIC EDUCATION IN INDIANA
PERCEPTIONS OF FUTURE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
THE ROLE OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS IN STUDENT SELF-CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT
RE-EDUCATION IN HUMAN COMMUNICATIONS
SOCIALLY MAINSTREAMING HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

THE TEACHER'S ROLE IN OTHERS-CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT
THE THORNS AND THREATS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION
TOWARD A RATIONALE FOR A SUPERVISORY MODEL OF INSTRUCTION IN MULTICULTURAL STUDENT POPULATIONS OR SWEATHOGS WON'T BITE
TWELVE-YEAR FOLLOW-UP STUDY: ROLE AND STATUS OF CURRICULUM WORKERS IN INDIANA
USING MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION TO PROMOTE LEARNING
USING MICROCOMPUTERS IN SCHOOLS: SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS